DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 476 EC 093 197

AUTHOR Enos, Donald F.; Harris, Ben M.
TITLE An Analysis of Training Experiences in the Special Education Supervisor Training Project 1973-1975. Document No. 14.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Dept. of Educational Administration.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
GRANT 74-75-0955
NOTE 108p.; See EC 093 196 for additional information

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; *Handicapped Children; Performance Based Teacher Education; *Practicums; *Program Evaluation; Special Education; *Special Education Teachers; Supervisors; *Supervisory Training; *Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

Presented are an analysis of the field training experiences, and end-of-program evaluation, and a short term follow up study of a 3-year competency based program to train special education supervisors at the University of Texas. Summarized are analysis findings (such as a mean of 13 different school visits per trainee) and satisfaction by trainees. Results of end of program evaluation (via a questionnaire of trainees) indicated that some competencies were covered well by course work while others were covered well in field experiences. Results of a telephone interview survey of the first group graduated (9 persons) is reported to have shown that 78% of the graduates held supervisory or administrative positions 1 year after leaving the project. Appended are such items as the field experience reporting form, a list of competency areas, a list of critical competencies, a list of activities for competency attainment, guidelines for exploratory field experiences, guidelines for the internship, and the end of program evaluation questionnaire. (DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136476

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN ANALYSIS OF TRAINING EXPERIENCES IN THE SPECIAL EDUCATION SUPERVISOR TRAINING PROJECT 1973 - 1975

Document #14

by

Donald F. Enos

In Collaboration with Ben M. Harris

Special Education Supervisor Training Project

Department of Educational Administration

The University of Texas at Austin

1976

EC093197

Funded by BEH/USOE (IAC), 74 75 0955 to the Texas Education Agency and College of Education, The University of Texas at Austin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Project Faculty and Staff	ii.
List of Tables	iv.
Preface	vi.
Introduction	1.
Definition of Terms	2.
Analysis of Field Experience Data	3.
Summary and Conclusions 1973-1974	17.
Analysis of Data 1974-1975	18.
Summary and Conclusions	33.
General Comparisons of Field Experiences 1973-1975	33.
End of Program Evaluation 1973-1974	34.
End of Program Evaluation 1974-1975	46.
Summary of a Telephone Interview Conducted with 1973-1974 SEST Trainees in Reference to Current Job Placement	55.
Appendices	
A. Field Experience Reporting Form (FERF)	60.
B. Competency Areas (1973-1974)	62.
C. Critical Competencies (1974-1975)	64.
D. Activities for Competency Attainment 1973-1975	69.
E. Guidelines for Exploratory Field Experiences	73.
F. Guidelines for Field Experiences (The Internship)	77.
G. End of Program Evaluation Questionnaire 1973-1974	81.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Appendices Cont. Page

H. End of Program Evaluation Questionnaire 1974 - 1975 . . . . . 85.

I. Telephone Interview Questionnaire for 1973-1974 SEST Students. . . . . 91.

Special Education Supervisor Training Project
Faculty and Staff
1973 - 1975

Project Co-Directors

Ben M. Harris, Professor of Educational Administration

John D. King, Associate Professor of Special Education and Educational Administration

Project Coordinator

Darryl R. Townsend, Ph.D.

Faculty

Lawrence W. Marrs, Assistant Professor of Special Education and Educational Administration

William A. Myers, Associate Professor of Special Education

Martha S. Williams, Associate Professor of Social Work

Special Consultants

E. Wailand Bessent, Professor of Educational Administration

Hayes Prothro, Chief Consultant, Special Education Personnel Development, Texas Education Agency

Other Staff

Joan DeLuca

Jane Duckett

Gary Hales

Howard Sanford

Mel Aguirre

Linda Guerrero

Barbara Lightsey

Joy Yong

Jane Sermersheim

Balcones Special Education Cooperative

Earl Humphreys

Hays Consolidated School District

Irene Helton

William M. Johnson

Field Supervisors
Austin Independent School District

Tom Hinojosa, Director
Special Education

Gerald Andersen

Carolyn Davis

Pauline Frey

Margaret Gately

Lester Mays

Ruth McAllister

Dee Peter

Bennett Scott

Gem Stokes

Margaret Webster

Region XIII Education Service Center

Helen Almanza

Barry Klein

Ben Wallace

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
TABLE 1-1	Hours of Field Experience for Each Competency Area (1973-1974)	4.
TABLE 1-2	Hours of Field Experience for Each Activity Descriptor (1973-1974)	6.
TABLE 1-3	Competency-Activity Matrix (73-74)	8.
TABLE 1-4	The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to School Sites (73-74)	10.
TABLE 1-5	The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to Office Locations (73-74)	11.
TABLE 1-6	The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to Other Locations (73-74)	13.
TABLE 1-7	Planning Responsibility for Activities in Relationship to Competency Attainment (73-74)	14.
TABLE 1-8	Involvement in Activities for Competency Attainment (73-74)	15.
TABLE 1-9	Satisfaction Received by Activities in Relation to Competency Attainment (73-74)	16.
TABLE 2-1	Hours of Field Experience for Each Critical Competency (1974-75)	20.
TABLE 2-2	Hours of Field Experience for Each Activity Descriptor (1974-75)	21.
TABLE 2-3	Competency - Activity Matrix (74-75)	22.
TABLE 2-4	The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to School Sites (74-75)	24.
TABLE 2-5	The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to Office Locations (74-75)	26.
TABLE 2-6	The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to Other Locations (74-75)	27.
TABLE 2-7	Planning Responsibility for Activities in Relationship to Competency Attainment (74-75)	28.

TABLE		PAGE
TABLE 2-8	Involvement in Activities for Competency Attainment (74-75)	29.
TABLE 2-9	Satisfaction Received by Activities in Relation to Competency Attainment(74-75)	32.
TABLE 3-1	Course Ratings for Knowledge and Skills Acquisition by SEST Students	46.
TABLE 3-2	The Relationship of Coursework to Critical Competencies	48.
TABLE 3-3	The Relationship of Exploratory Field Assignments to Critical Competencies	49.
TABLE 3-4	The Relationship of Internship Field Assignments to Critical Competencies	50.
TABLE 3-5	The Relationship of Internship Field Assignments to Providing Growth in the Trainee	51.
TABLE 3-6	Trainee Ratings of Special Activities	52.
TABLE 3-7	Trainee Ratings of Competency Assessment Procedures	54.
TABLE 4-1	Current Job Title-Positions for the 1973-1974 SEST Graduates	56.
TABLE 4-2	Task Area Responsibility for the 1973-1974 SEST Graduates	56.
TABLE 4-3	Contract Period for the 1973-1974 SEST Graduates	57.
TABLE 4-4	Contract Salary for the 1973-1974 SEST Graduates	57.

Preface

This document is one of the last two to be written to report on the work of the Special Education Supervisor Training Project from 1972 to 1975. During these three years, the Project staff developed competency specifications, designed and tested a competency-guided pre-service training programs, developed an array of training materials, and produced a competency assessment system. Of all these endeavors, the most difficult to document is the training program itself. All other aspects of the project are readily reflected by documents that have been previously published. This document #14 is an endeavor to capture in descriptive analysis at least some of the character of the SEST Project as it operated two years in a row (1973-74 and 1974-75) as a pilot program.

Dr. Donald Enos has utilized the extensive data collected throughout these years to objectively describe the training program using student, instructor, and field supervisor reactions. While a vast array of data was collected and used, this was not an experimental program; hence, no effort to draw comparisons or test for program effects were attempted.

Ben M. Harris
Project Co-Director

I.

INTRODUCTION

During the past decade, there has been an increasing interest and investment in providing services for children of special education classes throughout the United States. As the public schools have experimented with numerous programs and courses a multitude of problems has arisen. Among the most urgent concerns were those having to do with the provision of adequate leadership personnel to guide and direct changes. The Special Education Supervisor Training Project (SEST) was developed at The University of Texas at Austin for the purpose of helping to meet this need. The SEST Project was funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, United States Office of Education through agreements with the Texas Education Agency and the College of Education at The University of Texas at Austin for the specific purpose of developing a competency-guided program for the preparation of instructional supervisors to work in the area of special education and to generate a model adaptable to the competency-guided preparation of educational leaders of all kinds, including special education supervisors, general supervisors, principals, superintendents, and other leadership personnel.

This document presents an analysis of the field training experiences, end of program evaluation and short-term follow-up study conducted on the SEST trainees and graduates from 1973 through 1975.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Activity Descriptor: A descriptive list of thirty-eight activities of supervision of instruction from which trainees choose in categorizing experiences for fieldwork assignments (Appendix C).

Critical Competency: A description of a complex behavior pattern which is demonstrable in an actual performance setting (Appendix B and C). A critical competency is greater than the sum of its parts, an integrated "gestalt" consisting of general and specific knowledges and technical skills.

Field Experience: Field experiences are off-campus experiences in public education systems or institutional settings that are utilized in planned and coordinated ways to facilitate competency developments. These experiences include internships, visitations to institutions such as the Austin State School, the Education Service Center and meetings of professional associations or conferences and conventions that are directly connected to assigned field responsibilities.

Field Experience Reporting Form (FERF): The Field Experience Reporting Form is a form which the trainees utilize to communicate to the project faculty both the nature and extent of their fieldwork activities. It provides data from which the project staff may assess the efficacy of the fieldwork component (Appendix A).

ANALYSIS OF FIELD EXPERIENCE DATA

FOR 1973-1974

Hours of Field Experience for Each Competency Area

Table 1-1 shows the number of hours the ten (10) trainees spent working in each of the twelve competency areas in field related activities as reported on the Field Experience Reporting Form (FERF) (Appendix A). For the Spring semester 1974, the mean amount of field experiences for each trainee was approximately 515 hours spread over the twelve competency areas.* The maximum number of hours being devoted by the group was 884.5 for Competency Area 5 "Relating to People", while the minimum was 129.5 hours devoted to Competency Area 11 "Developing Supporting Services".

The trainees emphasized three major competency areas 5, 2, and 12 with over 600 to 800 hours devoted to each during the semester by the entire group. However, all other competency areas with the exception of #11, had at least 200 hours devoted to it by the trainee group. This indicates a fairly wide distribution of field experiences over competency areas by the SEST trainees.

NOTE: Competency areas are designated in Appendix B. In a later period in the Project these were revised as a list of critical competencies as shown in Appendix C.

TABLE 1-1

HOURS OF FIELD EXPERIENCE

FOR EACH COMPETENCY

COMPETENCY AREA	HOURS	PERCENTAGE
1. Assessing	463	9
2. Planning	733	15
3. Implementing	327.5	6
4. Evaluating	453	8
5. Relating to People	884.5	18
6. Communicating	370.5	7
7. Developing Curriculum	385	7
8. Developing Learning Resources	259.5	5
9. Staffing for Instruction	229.5	4
10. Developing the Organization	291	6
11. Developing Supportive Services	129.5	2
12. Developing In-Service Education	622.5	13
TOTALS:	5,147.5	100

Hours of Field Experience for Each Activity Descriptor

Table 1-2 indicates the number of hours utilized by the trainees for each of the thirty-eight activities (Appendix C) employed to facilitate competency development in the field. In examining the number of hours per activity it was found that the mean was 135.46 hours per activity. The maximum was 524.5 hours for activity #32, "Others", while the minimum was 0 hours for Activity #25, "Attending School Board Meetings". This resulted in a range of 524.5 hours.

Further examination of Table 1-2 shows ten of the activities (1,2,7,8,9,20,21,22,29, and 32) with more than 200 hours of involvement by the SEST trainee group. Thirteen of the activities received over 50 hours of involvement while fifteen received under 50 hours. Again, a pattern of participation in a wide-variety of activities is apparent.

Competency-Activity Matrix

A composite matrix relating the twelve competency areas to each of the thirty-eight activities is shown in Table 1-3. When comparing the two types of data, taken from the same report form, it was found that the competencies had a mean of 205.5 involvement responses while the activity mean was 64.82. The maximum and minimum involvement responses for the competencies were 366 to 62 while the activity maximum and minimum responses were 321 to 0. This resulted in a range for the competencies of 304 involvement responses and a range

TABLE 1-2

HOURS OF FIELD EXPERIENCE FOR EACH ACTIVITY DESCRIPTOR

ACTIVITY		HOURS	PERCENTAGE
1.	Attend lecture	433	8.4
2.	Read book	258.5	5.0
3.	Module used	21.3	.4
4.	Film/tape	76.5	1.5
5.	Lab/simulation	71	1.4
6.	Attended workshop	199.5	3.9
7.	Planned workshop	293.5	5.7
8.	Conducted workshop	342	6.6
9.	Consulted with teacher	323.2	6.3
10.	Conducted classroom observation	112.5	2.2
11.	Classroom observation without guide	67.5	1.3
12.	Case study	22	.4
13.	Testing a group	37	.6
14.	Testing self	10.5	.3
15.	Introduced new method	184	3.6
16.	Evaluation	109	2.1
17.	Parent conference	48	.9
18.	Attend meeting	87	1.7
19.	Analyzed data	178.5	3.4
20.	Wrote report	348	6.8
21.	Designed material	350	6.8
22.	Interviewed	236	4.6
23.	Assignment of personnel	15	.3
24.	Public relations	55	1.0
25.	School board meeting	0	0.0
26.	Meeting with field supervisors	89.5	1.7
27.	Visited educational site	108.5	2.1
28.	Consultation	33	.6
29.	Attended educational conference	256.5	5.0
30.	Attended profession meeting	13	.3
31.	Attended a convention	122	2.4
32.	Other	524.5	10.2
33.	Conference with principal	3.5	.05
34.	Conference with education personnel	59	1.5
35.	SEST meeting	18	.3
36.	Conference with faculty supervisor	37	.6
37.	Conference observation	1	.01
38.	Meeting sales people	4.5	.06
TOTALS:		5147.5	100.00%

of 321 involvement responses for the activities.

The trainees spent the majority of their time (14%) working on Competency Area #5, "Relating to People", and #12, "Developing In-Service Education", while Competency Area #11, "Developing Supporting Services", received the least (3%). In reference to activities, Activity 9, "Consulted with Teacher", and 32, "Other", received the majority of the time, 13% and 9% respectively. Activity 25, "Attending Schoolboard Meeting", was not attempted by any of the trainees.

It is significant to note that four major activity clusters, relating to the critical competencies, can be observed when examining the matrix. The first cluster is Activity 1 "attended a lecture", and Activity 2 "read an article or book". The other three are:

Activities 7-8-9-10 and 11: "planned a workshop or demonstration", "consulted with a teacher", "conducted a classroom observation without a guide".

Activities 18-19-20-21 and 22: "Attended an ARD or LST meeting", "tabulated, interpreted or analyzed data", "wrote a report or summary", "designed or adapted material", and "interviewed".

Activities 27-28-and 29: "visited another educational site not in the district to which assigned", "consulted with a school, district or educational enterprise other than that to which assigned", and "attended an educational conference".

TABLE 1-3

COMPETENCY/ACTIVITY MATRIX: SPRING, 1973

ACTIVITIES	COMPETENCY AREAS													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	%
1	4	14	2	2	8	4	29	5	3	12	4	9	96	4
2	10	11	7	11	19	8	9	5	13	24	5	15	137	6
3		3		4	3	1	1	1		1			14	.4
4	1	5	4	4	6	2	3	1	4	3	3	10	46	2
5	2		2		11		6	4	2			7	34	1
6	7	6	5	6	6	7	8	6	2		1	5	59	2
7	2	42	8	5	14	6	2	5	8	2	1	54	149	6
8	9	9	23	5	15	4	3	5	4	3		34	114	5
9	44	52	39	37	65	3	14	8	21	4	7	27	321	13
10	25	4	6	18	14		2	1	5	2	1	11	89	4
11	23	13	7	15	18		2	3	5	2	3	6	97	4
12	9	10	4	6	4			1	1			2	37	2
13	4		4	3	3	1	2		2			4	23	.8
14				2	1	1	1						5	.1
15	12	8	12	7	7	4	7	4	4	2	4	15	86	3
16	8	4	3	19	4	1	1	1	1			1	43	2
17				1		2							3	.1
18	6	13	9	10	8	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	57	2
19	15	16	8	26	7	2	4	4	4	1	2	5	94	4
20	8	20	4	27	23	13	5	5	8	11	3	16	143	6
21	4	12	3	4	5	7	8	12	7	2		8	72	3
22	15	14	4	8	15	13	3	6	17	10	7	11	123	5
23					1								1	0
24	2	1	1		2	6	2			3	2	2	21	.8
25													0	0
26	1	7	1	4	5	1	1		3	1		5	29	1
27	10	8	3	14	8	4	9	6	5	5	5	14	91	4
28	1	9	3	3	7	1	1	2		1	2	3	33	1
29	9	18	5	4	6	4	8		2	2		15	73	3
30	1	1		1		1					1	1	6	.1
31	3	1	1	3	2	4	9	8	2	5	2	13	53	2
32	12	46	12	15	36	8	13	16	19	5	5	28	225	9
33	1	4	1										6	.1
34		4	4	6	6	4	2	1	1	3	1	5	37	2
35	1	2		2				4	1	3			13	.4
36		8	2	4	3		1	1		1		7	27	1
37		1			1					1			3	.1
38							1	1				1	3	.1
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	%
Total	249	366	187	276	333	113	158	119	145	110	62	345	2,463	
Percent	10	15	8	11	14	4	6	5	6	4	3	14	100	

The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to School Sites

Table 1-4 indicates the amount of time spent in field experiences on school campuses as reported on the Field Experience Reporting Forms (FERF). There were a total of 66 schools visited by the 10 trainees during the Spring semester. This resulted in a mean of 11.4 schools visited per trainee. The total amount of time spent on school campuses was 1,512.5 hours resulting in a mean of 151.25 hours for each trainee. The 1,512.5 hours represented 61% of the total time spent in field experiences during the Spring semester.

Of the 66 locations, the University of Texas at Austin campus was reported having the largest share of time at 385 hours. The time ranged from the maximum of 385 hours to the minimum of one hour for the 66 locations. This resulted in a mean of 22.24 hours at any one location. Twelve of the 66 locations exceeded the mean and twenty of the locations were utilized for more than 10 hours each.

The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to Administrative Office Locations

Table 1-5 indicates the amount of time spent in field experiences in administrative offices as reported on the FERF's. There were five administrative offices visited by the trainees for a total of 98.5 hours resulting in a mean of 1.2 offices and 9.85 hours per trainee. The 98.5 hours represents 4% of the total time spent in field experiences.

TABLE 1-4
SPRING - 1974
THE RELATIONSHIP OF TIME SPENT IN FIELD EXPERIENCES TO SCHOOL SITES

SCHOOL					
University of Texas Campus	385	Richardson Independent School District	7	Westlake High School	2.5
Austin Independent School District*	237.5	Springdale Elementary	7	Maplewood Elementary	2.5
E.S.C. XIII	177.5	Holmes (Neb.)	7	Prestonwood Elementary	2.5
Hays Consolidated School	57	Becker Elementary	6.5	Kealing Center	2.5
Blackshear Elementary	54	Lamar Jr. High School	6.5	Pershing (Neb.)	2.5
Anderson High School	52	St. George (Neb.)	6	Pyrthe (Neb.)	2
Burnet Jr. High School	47.5	Blanco Independent School District	6	Central Elementary	2
Highland Park Elementary	46.5	Edgewood Independent School District	6	Pearce Jr. High School	2
Metz Elementary	46	Johnson High School	6	Govalle Elementary	1.5
Casis Elementary	36.5	Blanton Elementary	5.5	Gullett Elementary	1.5
University of Nebraska	25.5	Hamilton Park Elementary	5.5	Eanes Elementary	1.5
Austin State School	23	Brentwood Elementary	5	Riley Elementary	1.5
Seguin School District	18	Rosedale Elementary	5	Kyle Independent School District	1
Palm Elementary	17	St. Ignatus Elementary	4.5		
Travis High School	15	St. Johns Elementary	4.5		
Bedicheck Jr. High School	14.5	Wooten Elementary	4.5		
Crocket High School	14	O'Henry Jr. High School	4.5		
Porter Jr. High School	14	Joslin Elementary	4.5		
Oak Spring Elementary	13.5	Dobie Jr. High School	4.5		
Austin Community College	10	Hill Elementary	4		
Buda School District	10	Robert E. Lee Elementary	4		
Baker Elementary	10	Leander Independent School District	3.5		
Woodcreek Elementary	9.5	Emanual Elementary	3.5		
Pecan Springs Elementary	9	Dill Elementary	3		
Dripping Springs Elementary	9	Alan Jr. High School	3		
La Ronda Elementary	8.5	New Brumfields Elementary	3		
Balcones Coup.	8.5	Brooke Elementary	2.5		

TOTAL HOURS: 1,512.5

* NOTE: Austin Independent School District Field Experiences which were not specified by school are listed under this category.

The Austin Independent School District Administrative Center was reported as having the largest share of time a t 59.5 hours while the Texas Education Agency had the smallest share at 1.5 hours.

TABLE 1-5

THE RELATIONSHIP OF TIME SPENT IN FIELD EXPERIENCES TO OFFICE LOCATIONS

OFFICE LOCATION	TIME ALLOCATED
Austin Independent School District Administrative Center	59.5
Kealing Administrative Center	30
Education Service Center	7.5
Texas Education Agency	1.5
TOTAL HOURS	98.5

The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to Other Locations

Table 1-6 indicates the amount of time spent in field experiences in locations other than school campuses and administrative offices. The total number of hours spent in other locations was 857.5 with a mean of 85.75 hours for each individual. The 857.5 hours resulted in 35% of the total hours for field experience activities. There were 15 different "other" locations visited for the purpose of field experience activities resulting in a mean of 3.8 locations for each trainee. The maximum locations that trainees visited were 8 and the minimum 2.

It is significant to note that the location "Home" represented 15% of the total time for the semester. Further examination of the FERF's show that the majority of this time was spent for the purpose of developing materials, analyzing data from observations and planning workshops and other activities.

TABLE 1-6

THE RELATIONSHIP OF TIME SPENT IN

FIELD EXPERIENCES TO OTHER LOCATIONS

LOCATION	TIME	LOCATION	TIME
Home	366	Child Psychological Unit (Austin)	5
Council for Exceptional Children (N.Y.)	116	Bastrop State Park	5
Diagnostic Adjustment Center (Austin)	91.5	Richardson Independent School District Training Center	5
Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (Houston)	68.5	Marbridge Farm (Private School)	3.5
Thompson Conference Center (University of Texas)	67	Travis Library	3
Wimberly Retreat (Educational Administration Department)	20	Westminister Center	3
Austin Reading Clinic	5.5	Travis County Juvenile Court	2.5
		St. Davids Hospital	2

Planning Responsibility for Activities in Relationship to Competency Attainment

Table 1-7 deals with the amount of planning responsibility assumed by the trainees, for the activities in which they were engaged for each of the twelve competency areas. The category "Total Planning Responsibility" was utilized the largest number of times (505) for total of 31% while the minimum was "Spontaneous Planning" (214) for 13%.

The trainees had come type of planning responsibility for the activities in which they engaged 70% of the time while only 30% of the time were they involved with no planning responsibility.

Competency Areas #2, #12, and #5 were utilized the most in planning activities (15.6%, 14% and 13.9% respectively) while Competency Area #11 received the least amount of planning with 2.6%.

TABLE 1-7

FREQUENCY OF

PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTIVITIES IN

RELATIONSHIP TO COMPETENCY AREAS

Competency Areas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	T	%
Total Planning Responsibility	49	75	42	62	76	18	25	19	25	26	9	79	505	31
Planned Part of Activity	45	74	38	28	51	29	23	22	23	21	10	61	425	26
Spontaneous Planning	22	37	8	20	35	10	9	9	18	9	8	29	214	13
No Planning Responsibility	36	68	27	71	67	27	43	23	31	25	14	61	493	30
Total	152	254	115	181	229	84	100	73	97	81	41	230	1637	100
Percentage	9.3	15.6	7	11	13.9	5	6.2	4.6	5.9	4.9	2.6	14	100	

Involvement in Activities for Competency Attainment

Table 1-8 deals with the amount of involvement the trainees had in the activities designed for competency attainment. Types of involvement

were reported reflecting various roles as leaders, participants or observers. The maximum involvement by the trainees was as a "Fellow Participant" for 30% of the time while "No Participation at all" relected only 1% of the time. The trainees were involved, as Leader, Leader/Participant, Fellow Participant, Observer or Other Roles in the activities 99% of the total time with no participation being rarely reported. Despite limited experience and training, these trainees were assuming leadership responsibilities for nearly ½ of the activities.

TABLE 1-8

FREQUENCY OF

INVOLVEMENT IN ACTIVITIES

BY COMPETENCY AREAS

	Competency Areas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	T	%
INVOLVEMENT	Other	10	21	2	15	19	6	12	4	8	14	2	27	140	9
	Leader	41	63	47	41	64	15	14	21	18	12	8	60	404	25
	Leader/Partic.	47	62	27	30	57	24	23	15	22	27	13	45	392	24
	Fellow Partic.	36	86	28	61	65	30	29	25	36	19	13	69	497	30
	Observer	17	17	11	32	20	8	18	5	11	6	3	25	173	11
	No Partic.	1	5	0	2	4	1	4	3	2	3	2	4	31	1
	Total	152	254	115	181	229	84	100	73	97	81	41	230	1637	100
Percentage		9.3	15.6	7	11	13.9	5	6.2	4.6	5.9	4.9	2.6	14	100	

Satisfaction Received by Activity in Relation to Competency Attainment

Table 1-9 deals with the satisfaction received, by the trainees, for the activities designed to reach mastery level for each of the twelve competency areas. The maximum number of responses was 1,165 for the category "Enjoyed and Learned" while the minimum was 68 responses for the category "Other".

Further examination of the table shows 79% of the activities resulted in enjoyment while 17% resulted in no enjoyment. 4% of the time was questionable as to the level of satisfaction received.

The trainees felt 82% of the time was productive and learning took place. Only 14% was reported as non-productive and 4% of the time was questionable as to its ability to produce learning in the trainee.

TABLE 1-9

SATISFACTION RECEIVED BY ACTIVITY IN

RELATION TO COMPETENCY ATTAINMENT

Competencies		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	T	%
SATISFACTION	Other	4	11	5	6	12	7	4	3	4	2	3	7	68	4
	Enjoy & Learn	113	169	82	134	164	57	63	48	71	61	34	169	1165	71
	Enjoy, No Learn	10	25	11	12	17	4	11	4	9	3	0	19	125	8
	No Enjoy, Learn	19	29	15	18	22	7	10	15	8	5	3	22	173	11
	No Enjoy, No Lrn.	6	20	2	11	14	9	12	3	5	10	1	13	106	6
	Total	152	254	115	181	229	84	100	73	97	81	41	230	1637	100
Percentage		9.3	15.6	7	11	13.9	5	6.2	4.6	5.9	4.9	2.6	14	100	

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1973-1974

In summary, the Special Education Training Project (SEST) provided many field experiences for the trainees to develop skills necessary for special education supervisors. The 66 school sites visited with a mean of 22.24 locations per trainee provided a great array of training opportunities. Opportunities to observe, participate in, and direct activities for special education teachers were numerous. Visitations to offices and other locations added to the variety of training activities for each of the SEST students. The individuals reported the field activities as enjoyable and constructive with few exceptions.

When examining the field experience placement for 1973-1974, the majority of the experiences were in the public school setting. Further examination is needed to determine if student placement in other than educational settings would be beneficial to the training component.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

1974-1975

By this time, the developmental work of the project had progressed to the point of refining competency areas into twenty-seven carefully specified initial competencies. Reporting forms were also revised to reflect this. Nine trainees were involved in the project during this year.

Hours of Field Experience for Each Critical Competency

Table 2-1 shows the number of hours the trainees spent working in each of the twenty-seven critical competencies in field related activities as reported on the Field Experience Reporting Form (FERF) (Appendix A). For the 1974-1975 year the trainees had a mean of 93.6 hours of field experiences for each critical competency.* The maximum number of hours being 670 for Competency D2 "Revising Existing Structures," while the minimum was 8 hours in Competency C1 "Developing a Staffing Plan." This resulted in a range of 662 hours.

The trainees emphasized seven critical competencies A3, B4, D1, D2, F1, F2, and F3 with over 100 hours devoted to each during the year. Eighteen of the remaining critical competencies had a minimum of 50 hours.

Hours of Field Experience for Each Activity Descriptor

Table 2-2 indicates the number of hours utilized by the trainees for each of the thirty-eight activities(Appendix D) employed to facilitate the development of the twenty-seven critical competencies.

*Note: Critical competencies are designated in Appendix C.

In examining the number of hours per activity it was found that the mean was 66.5 hours per activity. The maximum was 558 hours for activity 12, "Did a Case Study," while the minimum was 0 hours for activities 29, "Attended an Educational Conference"; 30, "Attended Meeting of a Professional Organization"; 31, "Attended Convention"; 32, "Other"; 34, "Conference with Education Personnel", and 38, "Meetings with Sales People". This resulted in a range of 558 hours. Further examination of Table 2-2 shows six of the activities (7, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 25) with more than 100 hours of involvement by the trainees. Eighteen of the activities received over 50 hours of involvement while twenty received under 50 hours. A pattern of participation in a wide variety of activities is apparent.

Competency-Activity Matrix

A composite matrix relating the twenty-seven critical competencies to each of the thirty-eight activities is shown in Table 2-3. When comparing the two types of data, it was found that the competencies had a mean of 90.6 involvement responses, while the activity mean was 64.34. The maximum and minimum involvement responses for the competencies were 248 to 13 while the activity maximum and minimum responses were 538 to 0. This resulted in a range for the competencies of 235 involvement responses and a range of 538 involvement responses for the activities.

The trainees reported most frequently engaged (51%) working on seven competencies A1, B4, D1, D2, F1, F2, and F3, while competencies C1 and C4 were less (1.2%) frequent.

TABLE 2-1

HOURS OF FIELD EXPERIENCE FOR EACH CRITICAL COMPETENCY

COMPETENCY	HOURS	%	COMPETENCY	HOURS	%
Setting Instructional Goals (A1)	94	3.7	Scheduling Services (D3)	76	3.0
Utilizing Specialized Personnel (A2)	24	.9	Assimilating Programs (D4)	52	2.0
Adapting Curricula (A3)	135	5.3	Analyzing Services (E1)	73	2.9
Designing Instructional Units (A4)	57	2.3	Utilization of Services (E2)	48	1.9
Writing Educational Plans (A5)	50	2.0	Supervising with Clinical Model (F1)	140	5.5
Producing Learning Materials (B1)	65	2.7	Planning for Professional Growth (F2)	198	7.8
Securing Learning Resources (B2)	45	1.8	Conducting Training Sessions (F3)	199	7.9
Evaluating Learning Resources (B3)	37	1.5	Human Resources (F4)	54	2.1
Selecting Learning Materials (B4)	125	4.9	Training Leaders (F5)	16	.6
Developing Staffing Plan (C1)	8	.3	Informing the Public (G1)	94	3.8
Recruiting Personnel (C2)	23	.9	Involving the Public (G2)	27	1.1
Assigning Personnel (C3)	21	.8	Utilizing Public Opinion (G3)	61	2.5
Allocating Time to Function (C4)	12	.5			
Monitoring New Arrangements (D1)	123	4.8			
Revising Existing Structures (D2)	670	26.5			
			TOTAL HOURS FOR COMPETENCIES	2,527	

TABLE 2-2

HOURS OR FIELD EXPERIENCE FOR EACH ACTIVITY DESCRIPTOR

ACTIVITY	HOURS	PERCENTAGE
1. Attend lecture	91	3.6
2. Read book	58	2.3
3. Module used	25	.9
4. Film/tape	30	1.2
5. Lab/simulation	13	.5
6. Attended workshop	60	2.5
7. Planned workshop	260	10.3
8. Conducted workshop	69	2.7
9. Consulted with teacher	125	4.9
10. Conducted classroom observation	218	8.6
11. Classroom observation without guide	85	3.4
12. Case study	558	22.1
13. Testing a group	122	4.8
14. Testing self	82	3.2
15. Introduced new method	62	2.6
16. Evaluation	9	.3
17. Parent conference	89	3.5
18. Attend meeting	96	3.8
19. Analyzed data	48	1.9
20. Wrote report	29	1.1
21. Designed material	25	1.0
22. Interviewed	53	2.1
23. Assignment of personnel	59	2.3
24. Public relations	60	2.5
25. School board meeting	134	5.3
26. Meeting with field supervisors	12	.5
27. Visited educational site	7.5	.3
28. Consultation	8.5	.3
29. Attended educational conference	0	0
30. Attended profession meeting	0	0
31. Attended a convention	0	0
32. Other	0	0
33. Conference with principal	9.25	.4
34. Conference with education personnel	0	0
35. SEST meeting	8.75	.3
36. Conference with faculty supervisor	13.5	.5
37. Conference observation	7.5	.3
38. Meeting sales people	0	0
TOTAL HOURS FOR ACTIVITIES:	2,527	

TABLE 2-3

COMPETENCY/ACTIVITY MATRIX

ACTIVITIES	CRITICAL COMPETENCIES																										TOTAL	%
	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	D1	D2	D3	D4	E1	E2	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	G1	G2	G3	
1	7	1	3	3	3	8	5	1	5	1	7	4	2	11	11	3	5	4	2	3	11	17	6	2	14	4	5	145	5.9
2	4	2	2	3	3	10	5	3	2	1	1	1	2	4	10	4	3	1	4	3	3	17	4	2	9	4	2	121	4.8
3	3	1			1						2	2		3	4	2	4	2	1		1	3			6	1	5	41	1.6
4	2	1	2	1	1	2	3	3	5	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	3	4	7	1	2	6	2	3	64	2.6
5			1	3			2	2	4												1	2	1		1			17	.7
6	6	1	5	3	1	6	2	2	18				1						1		9	12	6	1	2	1		72	2.8
7	10		11	13	10	5	3	1	7	1		1	1	16	10	12	8	8	3	91	26	1		2	3			193	7.6
8	3	1	8	1	1	6	3	5	14								3		2		3	13	6		2	1	2	72	2.8
9	5		4	4	3	3	2	5	7	2	1	1	3	10	1		1	1	4	18	9	3	1			4	5	99	4.2
10	6	4	24	7	3	8	4	1	11	1	2	3	2	14	17	13	7	7	3	15	22	5	5	3	11	6	8	209	8.5
11	5	1	15	5	1	3	4	1	3					19	12	8	4	2	2	6	9				3	3		100	4.0
12	20	13	16	15	14	22	16	4	20	2	8	6	9	28	59	29	11	23	8	20	25	68	21	6	9	4	7	538	22
13	6		2	2	1	10	2	2	8		1			8	14	7	2	10	8	2	14	9	1		5	2		118	5.0
14		1			1		1	1	1	1				7	3	1		4	4	1	9	2			2		3	47	1.9
15	11	2	2	3	2	3	4	1	2	1	1	3	1	10	15	7	5	1	3	4	10	2	3	1	2	1		105	4.6
16											1														1			2	.08
17	1		1	1	2	2		6	6					6	6				4	1	4	1		1			1	48	2.0
18	19	5	3	4	3	3	5	4	10	1												4			6	2	5	74	2.9
19	3	4	6	4		3	4		1		1			1			1	1	1	3	3	2	2		1			41	1.6
20			1		2	1								2		1	2	1		5	4	2		1	1			23	.9
21			2			1	1	1			1			2							2	2		1	4	1	2	20	.8
22	11	2		4	3	6	4	3	8	1		1	2	4	11	4	1	5	6	2	7	10	1	1	3	1		101	4.6
23	9	1		2	4	1			1		1	2		4	3		2		1	3	3	3		2				40	1.5
24				1		15	1	2	2					6	6				1		14	12	2					62	2.5
25	3	1	6	2	3	9	6	4	2			1	1	4	10	5		3	2	4	2	3	2		4	2		80	3.3
26							1		1					2						1	2							7	.4
27																							1					1	.02
28						1															1		1					3	.1
29																												0	0
30																												0	0
31																												0	0
32																												0	0
33														3														3	.1
34																												0	0
35																												0	0
36														1						1								2	.08
37																				1								1	.02
38																												0	0
	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	D1	D2	D3	D4	E1	E2	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	G1	G2	G3	Total	%
Total	142	41	120	81	67	120	78	50	144	13	28	26	19	163	198	97	60	75	62	137	248	205	64	25	95	39	48	2445	100
Percent	5.8	1.6	4.7	3.3	2.7	4.7	3.1	2.0	5.8	.5	1.2	1.0	.7	6.9	8.2	3.9	2.8	3.3	2.5	5.4	10.2	8.7	2.8	1.0	3.8	1.5	1.9	100	

It is significant to note that two major activity clusters, relating to the critical competencies, can be observed when examining the matrix. The first cluster is activity 1 "attended a lecture", and activity 2 "read an article or book". The second cluster is activities 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13: "consulted with a teacher", "conducted a classroom observation with a guide", "conducted a classroom observation without a guide", "did a case study, behavior tally or anecdotal record on one child", and "used an instrument/questionnaire/test with a group".

It is also significant to note that activities 29 through 38 received almost no attention from any of the trainees during the one year period.

The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to School Sites

Table 2-4 indicates the amount of hours spent in field experiences on school campuses as reported on the Field Experience Reporting Forms. There were a total of 65 various schools visited by the nine trainees during the 1974-1975 year. This resulted in a mean of 13.22 school campuses visited. The total amount of time spent on school campuses was 1540 hours resulting in a mean of 171.1 hours for each trainee. The 1540 hours represented 61% of the total time spent in field experiences during the 1974-1975 school year.

Of the 65 locations, The University of Texas at Austin campus was reported having the largest share of time at 372 hours. The time ranged from the maximum of 372 hours to the minimum of .5 hours for the 65 locations. This resulted in a mean of 23.69 hours. Fifteen of the 65 locations exceeded the mean and thirty of the locations were utilized for more than 10 hours each.

TABLE 2-4

FALL/SPRING - 1974-75

THE RELATIONSHIP OF TIME SPENT IN FIELD EXPERIENCES TO SCHOOL SITES

SCHOOL	HOURS	SCHOOL	HOURS	SCHOOL	HOURS
University of Texas Campus	372	Harris Elementary	14	Burnet Junior High	3.5
ESC XIII	171.75	Campbell Elementary	13.75	Sunset Valley Elementary	3
Westwood High School	111.75	Reilly Elementary	11.75	Dobie Jr. High School	3
Ortega Elementary	91	Casis Elementary	11.75	O'Henry Jr. High School	2.75
Palm Elementary	54.75	Barton Hills Elementary	11.5	Highland Pk. Elementary	2.5
Allison Elementary	52.5	Maplewood Elementary	11.25	Walnut Creek Elementary	2
Baker Elementary	43.75	Crocket High School	9.75	Allan Jr. High School	2
Wooten Elementary	41.25	Mathews Elementary	9.5	Blankshear Elementary	2
Kileen High School	38.5	Mary Lee School for Girls	9	Zilker Elementary	1.75
Kealing Center	36.25	McCallum High School	8.5	Travis High School	1.5
Harlinger Elementary	30.5	Rosedale Elementary	7.75	Fulmore Jr. High School	1.5
Web Elementary	28.75	Eanes Elementary	7.5	Joslin Elementary	1.5
Becker Elementary	28.75	Zavala Elementary	6.75	Pillow Elementary	1.5
Austin Independent School District*	27.5	Bedichek Jr. High School	6.5	Lamar Jr. High School	1.25
Rosewood Elementary	25	Ridgetop Elementary	6	Andrews Elementary	1
Johnson High School	22.5	Read Elementary	6	Pease Elementary	.75
Linder Elementary	22.25	Travis Heights Elementary	5.5	Gullett Elementary	.5
Oak Hill Elementary	19.5	Brooke Elementary	5.5		
Dawson Elementary	18	Reagan High School	5.5		
LBJ High School	17.5	Oak Springs Elementary	5.25		
Barrington Elementary	17	Cunningham Elementary	5		
Pearce Junior High School	16.25	Cook Elementary	4.75		
Martin Junior High School	15	Blanton Elementary	4.5		
Robert E. Lee Elementary	14.75	Jeffrey Elementary	4		

TOTAL HOURS: 1540

*Note: Austin Independent School District Field Experiences which were not specified by school are listed under this category.

The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to Office Locations

Table 2-5 indicates the amount of hours spent in field experiences in administrative offices as reported on the FERF's. There were six offices visited by the trainees for a total of 495 hours resulting in a mean of 2.66 offices and 55.0 hours per trainee. The 495 hours represents 19.6% the total time spent in field experiences.

The Texas Education Agency was reported as having the largest share of time at 256 hours while the Region V Administrative Center had the least at 20 hours.

The Relationship of Time Spent in Field Experiences to Other Locations

Table 2-6 deals with the amount of hours spent in field experiences in locations other than school campuses and administrative offices. The total number of hours spent in other locations was 492 with a mean of 54.66 hours for each individual. The 492 hours resulted in 19.4% of the total hours for field experience activities.

There were 31 different locations visited for the purpose of field experience activities resulting in a mean of 3.4 locations for each trainee. The maximum locations that trainees visited were 12 and the minimum 2.

It is significant to note that the location (Home) represented 32.4% of the total time for the category "other locations". Further examination of the FERF's show that the majority of this time was spent for the purpose of developing materials, analyzing data from observations and planning workshops and other activities.

TABLE 2-5

THE RELATIONSHIP OF TIME SPENT IN FIELD EXPERIENCES TO OFFICE LOCATIONS

OFFICE LOCATION	TIME ALLOCATED
Texas Education Agency	256
Austin Independent School Districts Administrative Center	121.5
Special Education Resource Center	39.5
Region II Service Center	36
Texas State Teacher's Association	22
Region V Service Center	20

TOTAL HOURS: 495

There were 31 different locations visited for the purpose of field experience activities resulting in a mean of 3.4 locations for each trainee. The maximum locations that trainees visited were 12 and the minimum 2.

It is significant to note that the location (Home) represented 32.4% of the total time for the category "Other Locations". Further examination of the FERF's show that the majority of this time was spent for the purpose of developing materials, analyzing data from observations and planning workshops and other activities.

Planning Responsibility for Activities in Relationship to Competency Attainment

Table 2-7 indicates the amount of planning responsibility, by the trainees, for the activities designed to reach mastery level for each of

TABLE 2-6

THE RELATIONSHIP OF TIME SPENT IN
FIELD EXPERIENCES TO OTHER LOCATIONS

LOCATION	TIME	LOCATION	TIME
Home	159.75	Bahama Jr. College	5.5
Council for Exceptional Children (Los Angeles)	74.75	Lockhart	5
Dallas Convention	48.25	Corpus Christi Schools	5
Port Aransas Schools	36	Marbridge Ranch School	5
Texas School for the Blind	23.5	Capital Area Rehabilitation Center	4
Texas Association for Supervision, Curriculum and Development	23.5	Austin Public Library	3.5
Thompson Center	12	Diagnostic Adjustment Center	3
St. Mary's	9.5	Austin Development Center	2.5
Social Work Department	9	LBJ School of Public Affairs	2
Area Learning Resource Center	8	School for Handicapped	1.75
Austin State Hospital	8	St. Johns Hospital	1.5
Southwest University	7	State Institute for the Blind	1.5
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory	7	Southwestern Bell Telephone Company	1
Convention, New Orleans	7	Austin Evaluation Center	1
Georgetown	5.5		
Fisher, Texas	5.5		
Laredo, Texas	5.5		

TOTAL HOURS: 492

TABLE 2-7

FREQUENCY OF PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTIVITIES IN RELATIONSHIP TO CRITICAL COMPETENCIES

CRITICAL COMPETENCY	TOTAL PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY	PLANNED PART OF THE ACT	SPONTANEOUS PLANNING	NO PLAN RESPONS.	TOTAL	%
A1	23	23	6	32	84	5.47
A2	1	10	1	16	28	1.82
A3	20	21	3	26	70	4.56
A4	12	17	2	18	49	3.19
A5	14	11	1	19	45	2.93
B1	16	29	1	20	66	4.30
B2	9	21	3	16	49	3.19
B3	5	12	3	8	28	1.82
B4	21	27	3	20	71	4.62
C1	3	3	1	6	13	.85
C2	0	2	2	7	11	.71
C3	3	3	3	8	17	1.10
C4	3	5	0	8	16	1.04
D1	32	28	16	33	109	7.09
D2	44	51	10	32	137	8.91
D3	12	23	3	26	65	4.22
D4	7	6	6	20	39	2.53
E1	14	19	1	20	54	3.51
E2	13	11	4	14	42	2.73
F1	47	32	4	17	100	6.50
F2	47	57	10	38	152	9.88
F3	29	53	5	37	124	8.06
F4	10	13	5	13	41	2.66
F5	1	4	2	10	17	1.10
G1	9	9	3	38	59	3.83
G2	0	3	2	17	22	1.43
G3	3	6	3	18	30	1.95
TOTAL	398	499	103	537	1537	100
PERCENTAGE	25.89	32.47	6.7	34.94	100%	

TABLE 2-8

FREQUENCY OF INVOLVEMENT IN ACTIVITIES
BY CRITICAL COMPETENCIES

CRITICAL COMPETENCY	OTHER	LEADER	PARTICIP. LEADER	FELLOW PARTICIP.	OBSERVER	NO PARTIC. AT ALL	TOTAL	%
A1	3	17	16	27	21	5	89	5.54
A2	3	1	7	14	3	2	30	1.87
A3	1	26	16	13	15	0	71	4.42
A4	1	9	16	12	16	0	54	3.36
A5	2	13	6	9	17	0	47	2.92
B1	10	13	15	21	12	0	71	4.41
B2	3	8	14	16	9	1	51	3.17
B3	4	4	4	12	5	0	29	1.80
B4	11	16	18	17	12	0	74	4.6
C1	2	2	3	5	1	0	13	.80
C2	0	0	1	14	2	0	17	1.05
C3	2	3	3	7	2	0	17	1.05
C4	0	0	4	8	4	0	16	.99
D1	5	25	12	34	34	6	116	7.22
D2	12	30	30	51	18	1	142	8.84
D3	3	11	17	16	21	1	69	4.29
D4	2	5	9	8	17	0	41	2.55
E1	5	10	11	14	14	2	55	3.42
E2	4	12	9	10	4	2	42	2.61
F1	0	23	24	30	25	3	105	6.53
F2	10	31	39	55	27	1	163	10.14
F3	16	25	22	39	21	1	124	7.72
F4	2	5	13	14	5	1	40	2.49
F5	0	1	3	9	3	1	17	1.06
G1	6	5	14	17	16	2	60	3.73
G2	3	1	3	9	5	1	22	1.37
G3	3	3	2	18	6	0	32	1.87
TOTAL:	113	299	331	449	335	30	1607	100%
PERCENTAGE:	7.03	18.60	20.60	31.01	20.90	1.86	100%	

the activities designed to reach mastery level for each of the twenty-seven competencies. The category "No Planning Responsibility" was utilized the maximum number of times (537) for a total of 34.94% while the minimum was "Spontaneous Planning" (103) for 6.7%. The trainees had some type of planning responsibility, 65.06% of the time.

Critical competencies D1, D2, F2, and F3 were utilized most in planning activities (7.09%, 8.91%, 9.88% and 8.06% respectively) while critical competencies C1 and C2 received the least amount of planning with .85% and .71%.

Involvement in Activities for Competency Attainment

Table 2-8 deals with the amount of involvement the trainees had in the activities designed for competency attainment. The maximum involvement by the trainees was with "Fellow Participant" for 31.01% of the time while the minimum was "No Participation at all" for only 1.86% of the time. The trainees were actively involved, to some degree in a "Leader, Leader/Participant, Fellow Participant, Observer or Other" for competency attainment 98.14% of the total time.

Satisfaction Received by Activity in Relation to Competency Attainment

Table 2-9 deals with the satisfaction reported by the trainees, from the activities designed to reach mastery level for each of the twenty-seven critical competencies. The maximum number of responses was 1272 for the category "Enjoyed and Learned" while the minimum was 22 for the category "Other". Further examination of the table shows 86.15% of the time resulted

in enjoyment of the activities while 12.34% resulted in no enjoyment. 1.51% of the time was questionable as to the level of satisfaction received.

The trainees felt 95.58% of the time was constructive and learning took place despite enjoyment or satisfaction with the activity. Only 2.91% was reported as non-constructive and 1.51% of the time was questionable as to its ability to produce learning in the trainee.

TABLE 2-9

SATISFACTION RECEIVED BY ACTIVITY IN RELATION TO COMPETENCY ATTAINMENT

CRITICAL COMPETENCY	OTHER	ENJOYED & LEARNED	ENJOYED BUT NOT LEARNING	NO ENJOYMENT BUT LEARNING	NO ENJOYMENT & NO LEARNING	TOTAL	%
A1	0	71	3	8	2	84	5.54
A2	0	22	1	5	0	28	1.85
A3	1	59	0	7	1	68	4.48
A4	0	47	0	4	1	52	3.43
A5	1	36	1	5	1	44	2.90
B1	1	60	1	2	1	65	4.29
B2	0	42	1	6	2	51	3.36
B3	0	21	0	6	2	29	1.92
B4	2	53	2	10	3	70	4.62
C1	0	11	0	2	0	13	.86
C2	0	15	0	1	0	16	1.05
C3	0	8	0	2	2	12	.79
C4	0	13	1	2	0	16	1.05
D1	1	88	5	7	5	106	6.99
D2	2	123	2	6	3	136	8.97
D3	0	59	1	4	1	65	4.29
D4	2	34	0	2	1	39	2.57
E1	2	43	0	6	0	51	3.36
E2	2	35	1	4	0	42	2.79
F1	2	81	4	11	2	100	6.59
F2	3	116	7	12	7	145	9.56
F3	2	101	2	12	4	121	7.98
F4	2	30	0	5	2	39	2.58
F5	0	16	0	1	0	17	1.12
G1	0	45	1	8	2	56	3.69
G2	0	16	0	3	2	21	1.39
G3	0	27	1	2	0	30	1.98
TOTAL:	22	1272	34	143	44	1516	100%
PERCENTAGE:	1.51	83.91	2.24	9.43	2.91	100%	

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the Special Education Supervisor Training Project (SEST) provided adequate field experience for the trainees to develop skills necessary for supervisors in designated instructional leadership competencies. The 65 school sites visited with a mean of 13.22 locations per trainee provided a variety of training experience. Opportunities to observe, participate in, and direct activities for special education teachers were numerous. Visitations to offices and other locations added to the variety of training activities for each of the SEST students. The individuals reported the project as enjoyable and productive of much learning.

When examining the field experience assignments for 1974-75, the majority of the experiences were in the public school settings as in 1973-74. Further examination would be needed to determine if student placement in other than educational settings would be beneficial to the training component.

GENERAL COMPARISONS OF FIELD EXPERIENCES 1973-1975

Comparisons between the two groups, 1973-74 and 1974-75, cannot be drawn because of the extreme differences in the two programs. However, a few general observations may be made. The 1973-74 students (Group 1) visited a total of 66 various school sites during their training period while the 1974-75 students (Group 2) visited 65 sites. The mean for Group 1 was 11.4 schools visited while the Group 2 mean was 13.2 schools. Group 1 spent a total of 1512.5 hours for 61% of the time in field experience, while Group 2 spent 1540 hours also for 61% of the total time.

Group 1 visited 5 different office locations for 98.5 hours and 4%

of the total time while Group 2 visited 6 office locations for 495 hours and 19.6% of the total time spent in field experiences. Regarding "Other Locations", Group 1 visited 15 different locations for 857.5 hours resulting in 35% of the total time while Group 2 visited 31 different locations for 492 hours resulting in 19.4% of the time.

The 1973-1974 SEST group was involved in "Total Planning Responsibility" the majority of the time during their training period. However, the Group 2 students were involved in "No Planning Responsibility" for the majority of their training period. The area of "Spontaneous Planning" was reported as the least involved by both groups.

Both groups had maximum involvement acting as a "Fellow Participant" and reported minimum involvement in the category of "No Participation at All".

Both Group 1 and Group 2 enjoyed and learned from the SEST Project activities and felt that the majority of the time was spent in constructive activities. Only a mean of 8.45% of the time was reported as nonconstructive by both groups.

END OF PROGRAM EVALUATION
1973-1974

The trainees (1973-1974) completed an end of program evaluation questionnaire (Appendix 6) during the month of May, 1974. The questionnaire was divided into five areas: (1) Classwork, (2) Fieldwork, (3) Materials, Travel and Other, (4) Program Operation, and (5) General Comments.

Classwork:

A. To what degree was the classwork helpful to you in gaining knowledge and/or skills that you consider to be essential to your growth?

The response of the trainees in general, was that the coursework was

not overly helpful. They felt the coursework and theory were necessary, but stated that there was little reference to its practical applications in the field.

B. What aspects should be contined or enlarged?

Most of the trainees seemed very satisfied with the course entitled "Organizational Theory", but felt that group functioning should be enlarged. Most all trainees were dissatisfied with the Curriculum Design Course and felt changes should definitely be incorporated into next years program. They also felt more skill practice was needed in all coursework.

C. How could classwork have been more helpful to you?

The trainees suggested that outside reading material be assigned to correspond with courses and that the available materials be included in bibliographies. They also felt that: (1) course outlines should be given out at the beginning of each course; (2) teachers should provide more skill application and carefully structure it to the coursework; and (3) the assignments should be relevant to all field experiences. The trainees also felt they did not receive enough exposure to budgeting and working within Plan A, Bulletin 711 and that this was a major weakness in the program.

D. Should additional courses be included? Or at least available? Which ones?

There should be additional classes offered at the consultant level which deal with human relations. The Curriculum Design class should be improved. More courses are needed in the "trouble" areas; time utilization studies, budgeting, personnel and supportive staff requirements and job descriptions. Additional special education classes and more evaluation classes should also be offered.

E. To what extent was classwork related to the critical competencies?

Most of the trainees felt their coursework was only vaguely related to the critical competencies. The in-service design, organizational theory, and human relations courses were mentioned as being most related while the curriculum design course was mentioned as failing to meet the objectives.

F. Other comments or suggestions regarding classwork.

The trainees felt that the course "organizational theory" was enlightening. They stated that class assignments should be as relevant as possible to actual field experience. They also suggested that there be skill-building sessions in leadership skills such as consultation techniques and interviewing techniques presented in intensive two week blocks with videotaping.

Fieldwork:

A. Evaluate your field assignment in terms of its ability to prepare you to be a special education supervisor.

Several of the trainees personally felt they were not ready for the position of Special Education Supervisor, but according to Austin I.S.D standards, they would be. One trainee felt the supervisor should have shared goals, strategies, and planning processes with them while another felt the program was limited in its opportunity for inservice training. Still another felt the tasks were very routine, slow moving and repetitious. The major weakness noted was in the area of administrative duties. (Budgeting and personnel assignments.)

B. How could it have been more beneficial?

The trainees stated that the field work would have been more beneficial if more activities were available to meet the competencies. They also noted that the activities should occur in a greater variety of sites. The examples

cited were elementary, secondary, private and/or state institutions. It was suggested that these experiences be contractual and nonpermanent experiences.

C. What aspect(s) was the most helpful?

The trainees felt that the ability to call on a faculty advisor for help and the freedom the supervisor allowed were most helpful. The opportunity to learn about general procedures, the contact with people in the field, supervising student teachers, and the commitment of the field supervisor were also very useful.

D. What frustrations did your field supervisor experience in connection with your work together? How could it (they) be remedied?

One trainee stated that an all day period of supervision, everyday for six weeks would be better than 3 days a week for an entire semester. Another did not know how best to plan needs, while still another stated the field supervisor was not sure of his/her responsibility to the trainees. One trainee felt the field supervisor was "too busy to get organized" while another felt that her presence made the field supervisor's tasks longer because of the additional time it took to explain or provide extra information.

E. What would you think of field assignments that were topic or competency oriented, in which you would work for a specific time to accomplish a specific assignment and then move on to another assignment, rather than serving the whole semester with one person.

Overall the answers to the above question were favorable. The trainees commented that planning and coordination of assignments were needed. The contract person should know specifically what the intern was there for, how long, and the anticipated outcomes. Another added that a minimum of eight weeks would be needed in a specific assignment in order to properly evaluate accomplishments. Several drawbacks were mentioned. They were:

(1) It would be hard to develop a growing relationship with an individual; (2) certain tasks can not always be adequately programmed into a specified amount of time; and (3) the experience might become fragmented and the trainee would miss the opportunity to experience the role ot supervisor.

F. How would you evaluate the field site to which you were assigned in terms of providing a meaningful experience for you?

The majority of the trainees were quite satisfied with the results. However, two individuals evaluated the sites at which they worked as poor. Still another stated the field supervisor was more important than the site itself.

G. In what specific areas would you like to have had field experiences which you did not get?

Additional field experience in the area of curriculum development was mentioned by the majority of the trainees. Additional responses were: more work with individual teachers; consulting and giving workshops; developing learning resources; assessing materials; developing supportive services; developing the organization; "M & O" of Special Education programs; developing learning resources; and staffing for instruction.

H. How could field experiences be more individualized?

Several trainees suggested the field supervisor and trainee be matched in such a way that they would complement each other. The trainees weak areas should be identified and then he/she should be placed with a field supervisor who is strong in that area. It was also suggested that the trainees be allowed to contract for certain tasks.

I. Other comments or suggestions regarding field work.

The suggestions and comments regarding fieldwork experiences were varied. One individual enjoyed it and felt it was a very meaningful part of the project while another felt it was a total waste of time. Other trainee comments included: the assignments should be rotated based on competency ratings; other sites for field experiences should be made available, expecially on the junior college level, and at locations like the Southwest Educational Laboratory.

III. Materials, Travel and Other

A. How often did you use project materials?

Most all of the trainees stated they used the project materials only on occasion. They were used, however, to fulfill class assignments by most of the trainees.

B. Which ones did you use? To what extent were the ones used helpful?

The sources that were used included: Conflict, Transactional Analysis, Glasser Films, Bloom, Krathwhol "Taxonomy," PRIME, Johari slides, Decision Making, various textbooks, and the PERT programming workbook. The trainees felt these materials were quite helpful.

C. How could the materials be made a more integral part of the program?

The trainees felt that particular assignments should be geared to the materials and worked into the classes as well as being included in the professors' bibliographies. It was suggested that the trainees be given more time to use them and that learning packets for each competency area be designed.

D. Which of the workshops conducted during the year were most valuable?

The responses were quite varied on this question. The list includes: internal consulting, micro-consulting, parental involvement, Glasser films, assessing -- WISC and ITPA, strategies, observation, assertive training workshops, and cultural awareness workshops.

E. What suggestions do you have with regard to adding other workshops, deleting some, doing more workshop-type activities, etc?

The trainees felt it might be necessary to incorporate two or four day workshops into the program. One day workshops' tended to leave the trainees with feelings of frustration. Another suggestion included intensive mini-courses with skill development. It was also suggested that assertive or group interaction workshops be conducted at the beginning of the program to help the group relax with one another. Outside authorities should be brought in for workshops on subjects such as: minority education, secondary programs, and consultation.

F. Evaluate the travel options that were available to you during the year. How useful were those opportunities? Should anything be changed in this regard?

The majority of the trainees expressed appreciation for the travel options. However, it was suggested to meet before the trips and consider all the ways to best utilize the trip. That is: to learn of job opportunities; practice interviewing; and planning for the best experience while there. Two negative items were mentioned concerning travel options. They were: (1) the lack of knowledge about what would be helpful to see and (2) the lack of time.

G. How could field trips in Austin be made more meaningful?

Several trainees felt there should be more preparation before trips.

Some suggestions were: state objectives before trip; discussions should occur beforehand to enable the trainee to be more critical in observation; and discussions should also follow the trip. It was further suggested that field trips should not be on a class assigned basis but voluntary.

H. To what extent should independent study activities be built into the program?

Several trainees stated that independent study activities should be a major part of the program. One of them suggested having initial group meetings and then continuing in independent study activities. It was also suggested that so long as 15 hours of course work were required, independent study seemed inappropriate.

I. What kinds of things should be taught by independent study activities?

Many competency areas could be taught by independent study activities. In particular, planning, assessing, and evaluating were mentioned. Other independent activities could be included in the areas where the student feels incompetent or because of a special interest has chosen a topic to investigate.

J. What other activities, special events, etc., did you participate in that you feel were helpful and/or enjoyable? Were there any that were not enjoyable?

The activities, special events, etc., that the trainee felt were helpful and/or enjoyable were: assisting in the SEASIM presentation at Teachers' College Columbia; accompanying Dr. King to Lincoln, Nebraska on a consulting trip; the media project for delivery of educational services in Nebraska; parental involvement conference; Austin Independent School District workshop on learning disabilities; experiences with Mr. Rivera in interviewing prospective teacher applicants; leadership effectiveness training; opportunities to

participate in project development; informal visits with people from the field; and field experiences at the Education Service Center. One trainee stated that busywork time-fillers such as materials evaluation and mapmaking were not enjoyable while another did not enjoy the assertiveness training or the ethnic awareness workshops.

K. Other comments regarding this category.

There were no responses from the trainees.

IV. Program Operation

A. What aspects of the program operation do you feel were helpful to you and/or contributed to the program?

The following aspects were mentioned as helpful to the program: staff meetings, availability of staff, conscientious and highly productive coordinator, helpfulness of secretaries, clearly explained reporting of activities, staff's willingness to listen and help, and the opportunity to try and learn new ideas through field experiences.

B. What specific aspects of program operation could be improved as to be more helpful to students? Do you have suggestions for improving them?

The specific aspects which the trainees felt could be improved were: utilization of student input; making the program more individualized; preparing vitas on field supervisors and letting the trainees select the one they desire; offering classwork in blocks; providing more field sites; splitting interships; allowing trainees to be a part of the group involved in making decisions about the calendar, workshops, and program changes; using the university supervisor as a laison between the trainees and staff; allowing

time for trainee involvement in project development; better orientation and immediate involvement in supervisory activities; designing better communication channels; and better planning on the part of the project staff.

C. Do you feel that any aspects were counterproductive or inhibited you in some way? If so, what are they, and how should they be changed?

All trainees stated that there were aspects which were counterproductive or inhibitive. One felt the attitude of the faculty was ambivalent regarding the philosophy of the program - is it competency-based or not. Several trainees expressed their dissatisfaction with the activity forms. Other statements included: the constructive use of student input; the failure to stick to scheduled events - shifting time; classwork needed balancing in terms of field work; more practical input on structure of field site organization before internship; more help with employment; more structure about classwork requirements; and the encouragement of trainees to develop an activity, idea, guide or thought on an individualized basis was overlooked.

D. What should be the student's role in the ongoing operation of the program?

The trainees input should be utilized by the staff, their vote should be counted, and their experience should be utilized. The trainees should be highly involved and regarded. They should participate in the competency development and evaluation and actively review materials. They should also continue to participate in staff meetings, be involved to the extent that their efforts are productive and willingly shared.

E. Other comments regarding program operation.

Comments regarding program operation include: advisors and trainees should be matched using a similar process of fraternal organizations -- three

preferences and matched by the director. Aspects of program operation should be capitalized on in terms of learning experience, i.e., budgeting, proposal preparation and reporting, and the mechanics of putting a program together and making it work.

V. General

A. What items or aspects of the program stand out as being most beneficial, helpful or memorable in terms of professional growth?

The following aspects of the program were most beneficial to professional growth: Organization Theory; field experiences, and Inservice Design classes. The trainees also benefited from sitting in on staff meetings, the supportiveness of Dr. Harris, the opportunity to work with Dr. King and Dr. Marrs on extraneous projects, and field trips.

B. Do you feel that any aspects of the program should be completely deleted? If so, which ones, why, and should they be replaced with anything?

The trainees expressed dissatisfaction with the Curriculum Design course. They commented that it failed to meet the needs in the skill areas of developing curriculum and evaluation of curricular materials as well as failure to provide opportunities to anyalyze existing curriculum. One trainee felt the clinical supervision model should be omitted. Another stated trips to Austin schools should be redesigned.

C. Should anything be added to the program that was not included? What and why?

One trainee suggested adding a delivery-feedback system while another suggested a supportive system be incorporated that would also function as a

staff development component. Other suggestions included: group sessions both structured and informal; more videotaping of activities; simulations; team building -- OD workshops -- to achieve functional group relations; and additional training in observation instruments, including supervisory conferences, and student interactional analysis.

D. Do you have any other comments that have not been expressed so far?

One trainee commented that human resources were not taken into consideration during the training period. The trainees expressed general satisfaction with the project and felt it was a positive experience. However, the following criticisms were offered: Students should be informed as to why they were doing things, poor communications and a lack of faculty time. These areas of criticism led to a feeling of mistrust and uncooperativeness, on the part of the trainees, toward the end of the year.

END OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

1974 - 1975

Each of nine SEST trainees (74-75) completed an end of program evaluation questionnaire (Appendix H) during the month of July, 1975. The questionnaire was divided into four areas: (1) Classwork; (2) Fieldwork; (3) Materials, travel and other; and (4) Competency assessment.

The first question dealt with the degree of helpfulness of coursework toward gaining knowledge and/or skills essential to growth. The trainees rated each course on a 1 to 5 scale: (1) Not very helpful to (5) Extremely helpful. (Table 3-1)

TABLE 3-1

COURSE RATINGS FOR KNOWLEDGE

AND SKILLS ACQUISTION BY SEST STUDENTS

1974-1975

COURSE		RATING
EDA 380G	Structure & Organization in Public Education	3.3
EDA 383	Inservice Design	4.7
EDA 385	Practicum in Supervision	3.7
EDA 383	Organizational Theory	4.2
EDA 382M	Special Education Administration	3.0
EDA 384G	Seminar in Supervision	4.2
EDC 381M	Curriculum Design	1.1
SW 395K	Human Relations	3.3

Question 2 provided the trainees with the opportunity to discuss how coursework could have been more helpful during their training. Four of the trainees criticized the Curriculum Design course as ambiguous and non-productive. It was also suggested that the Special Education Administration course be more specific and provide students with more direction for study. The trainees expressed a desire to have more coursework in the areas of Critical Competency B (Developing Learning Resources) and Critical Competency D-4 (Assimilating Programs). It was also suggested that the Human Relations course include conflict resolution, the politics of education and informal organizational structure.

The next three questions provided the trainees with space to list the critical competencies which, in their opinion, related to each course, and to their exploratory and internship field assignments. The following tables show the relationship of classwork to critical competencies (Table 3-2), the relationship of fieldwork to critical competencies (Table 3-3, Appendix D), and the relationship of internship field assignments to critical competencies (Table 3-4, Appendix E).

In analyzing the three tables, it is apparent that certain competencies were covered well in one area but not in another. Competency areas A and B were grossly neglected in coursework but received adequate attention in field assignments. Competency area C was adequately covered in EDA 380G but not in the field assignments. However, this could possibly result from the nature of the competency. The same pattern also held for Competency area G. The "relating to the public" competencies were covered in four courses, but received little attention in the field. Competency area E was covered in EDA 382M but not listed by one trainee as being related to an exploratory

TABLE 3-2

THE RELATIONSHIP OF COURSEWORK
TO CRITICAL COMPETENCIES

CRITICAL COMPETENCIES**	COURSEWORK EDA 380G	EDA 385	EDA 383	EDA 382M	EDA 384G	EDC 381M	SW 395K
A1		X					
A2							
A3							
A4						X	
A5							
B1							
B2							
B3							
B4							
B5							
C1	X						
C2	X						
C3	X						
C4							
D1		X		X	X		
D2				X	X		
D3				X			
D4							
E1				X			
E2				X			
F1		X	X				
F2		X	X				X
F3		X	X				X
F4		X	X				X
F5		X	X				X
G1	X						X
G2	X	X					
G3	X	X			X		

** Competencies are listed as relating to coursework only if they are included on more than one evaluation form.

TABLE 3-3

THE RELATIONSHIP OF EXPLORATORY FIELD ASSIGNMENTS TO CRITICAL COMPETENCIES

CRITICAL COMPETENCIES	ATTENDING ARD MEETINGS	OBSERVING IST MEETINGS	WORKING WITH TEACHER TEAMS	ASSISTING TEACHERS IN DEVELOPING BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION PROGRAM	ACTING AS RESOURCE PERSON FOR MATERIALS AND INSTRUCTION	OBSERVING AND SUPERVISION	WRITING JOB DESCRIPTIONS	OBSERVING IN CLASSROOMS	PLANNING IN-SERVICE SESSIONS	REPORTING ON PROJECTS TO ADV COUNCIL
A1	X	X	X			X				
A2	X	X	X	X		X				
A3				X	X	X				
A4	X	X	X		X	X				
A5										
B1				X						
B2										
B3					X					
B4				X						
C1						X	X			
C2						X				
C3						X				
C4						X				
D1	X	X	X	X		X				
D2	X	X	X	X		X				
D3		X		X		X				
D4						X				
E1										
E2										
F1						X		X		
F2						X			X	
F3						X			X	
F4						X				
F5						X				
G1									X	X
G2										
G3										

TABLE 3-4

THE RELATIONSHIP OF INTERNSHIP FIELD ASSIGNMENT TO CRITICAL COMPETENCIES

FIELD ASSIGNMENTS / COMPETENCY	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	D1	D2	D3	D4	E1	E2	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	G1	G2	G3
REPORTING ON MATERIAL SELECTION	X	X		X					X																		
HELPING TEACHERS SET UP LEARNING CENTERS				X		X			X																		
ATTENDING ARD MEETINGS					X																						
MAKING FIELD TRIPS TO OBSERVE TEACHER RENEWAL CENTER			X	X		X																					
DEMONSTRATING MATERIALS						X	X	X	X																		
ANALYZING AND USING MATERIALS						X	X	X	X																		
HELPING TEACHERS ORDER MATERIALS								X	X																		
WRITING JOB DESCRIPTIONS										X																	
INTERVIEWING AND HIRING TEACHERS											X																
RESTRUCTURING OF INSTRUCTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS										X		X			X	X	X	X	X		X		X				
IMPLEMENTING NEW PROGRAMS															X	X	X										
HELPING ASSIMILATE A MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT									X								X					X					
WORKING WITH TEACHERS													X	X	X	X											
SURVEYING AVAILABLE RESOURCES																		X									
PLANNING AND PRESENTING IN-SERVICE SESSIONS																					X	X					
DETERMINING COMPETENCIES FOR VH TEACHERS																					X						
CONDUCTING PP & E TRAINING SESSIONS																								X			
REPORTING PROJECTS TO ADVISORY COUNCIL																									X		
SPEAKING AT PUBLIC MEETINGS																									X		
INTERVIEWING PERSON INVOLVED IN RECREATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED																											X

field assignment, and only listed sparingly in the internship field assignments. Areas D and F were two areas which seem to have received adequate attention in both coursework and field assignments. It is also significant to note that competencies A5 and B2 were neglected in all areas.

In conclusion, competency areas A and B need to receive more attention in coursework, while competency areas C, E and G need more emphasis in field assignments. Much of the coursework time being spent on areas F and G resulted in duplication.

The students were also asked to rate their internship field site in terms of providing growth in four areas. They used a 1 to 5 rating scale: (1) Limited to (5) Extensive (Table 3-5).

According to the trainees, the internship field sites seem to have provided satisfactory growth experiences in the four areas. The areas of human relations skill development and problem solving skill development were the only two rated as relatively limited.

TABLE 3-5

THE RELATIONSHIP OF INTERNSHIP FIELD ASSIGNMENTS TO PROVIDING GROWTH IN THE TRAINEE

GROWTH AREA	RATING
Critical Competency Development	3.9
Human Relations Skill Development	3.8
Problem Solving Skill Development	4.1
Self-Confidence as a Dynamic Leader	4.1

Finally, the trainees listed staffing and relating to the public as the two main competency areas in which they would have liked to have had further field experiences.

The trainees utilized the learning laboratory materials on an average of ten to twenty-five hours. Specifically, two students used the laboratory fewer than ten hours, five used it ten to twenty-five hours, and two used it twenty-five to fifty hours. Use of the learning laboratory materials generally was limited to the four competency areas of Developing Curriculum, Staffing for Instruction, Organizing for Instruction, and Providing In-Service Education.

Special activities provided during the project (a campout, interviewing sessions, professional meetings) were rated on a 1 to 5 scale: (1) Slightly Valuable to (5) Extremely Valuable (Table 3-6).

TABLE 3-6

TRAINEE RATINGS OF SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

SPECIAL ACTIVITY	RATING
Pre-Session Campout	2.0
Interviewing at Port Aransas	3.8
Interviewing at Killeen	3.8
Attending Professional Meetings	3.6

The average ratings for these activities, as well as comments by the trainees regarding workshops, field trips, and special activities indicate some attention needs to be given to the improvement of this area. Suggestions included carrying through with announced plans for special activities, encouraging interns to attend workshops and other activities by expressing interest in the activity, providing information on beneficial field trips, including students in the planning of special activities, and coordinating special activities and assignment deadlines. Also suggested was a workshop with previous SEST students and reworking of the initial field trips to allow more time for students and faculty to get to know one another.

The final section of the questionnaire asked the trainees to rate the competency assessment efforts conducted throughout the year. The trainees rated ten competency assessment efforts on a 1 to 5 scale (Table 3-7), (1) Not Very Useful to (5) Extremely Useful.

Generally, the trainees seem to have felt that in-progress assessment self-estimates were more useful than faculty or field supervisor estimates of competency. The only exception was the end of program assessment by the field supervisor.

The trainees then rated the validity of their scores on the Knowledge Assessment Tests for Critical Competencies (Appendix I) at the end of the program. Using a 1 to 5 scale: Valid on only a few, to (5) Valid on nearly all, the average rating was 3.2. This can be interpreted to mean that the trainees perceived the scores as valid on most of the tests.

Finally, the student rated the usefulness of the matrix analysis and other procedures in helping them understand both accomplishments and needs for future growth. Using the 1 to 5 scale; (1) Not very useful, to (5) Highly

TABLE 3-7

TRAINEE RATINGS OF COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE	RATING
Preassessment, using self-estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	2.7
Preassessment, using self-estimates on the Major Competency Assessment Inventory	2.2
In-progress assessment, using self-estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory (Dec.)	3.7
In-progress assessment, using self-estimates on the Major Competency Assessment Inventory	3.3
In-progress assessment, using faculty supervisor estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	2.3
In-progress assessment, using field supervisor (exploratory) estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	2.8
End of program assessment, using self-estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	3.7
End of program assessment, using self-estimates on the Major Competency Assessment Inventory	3.7
End of program assessment, using faculty supervisor estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	2.8
End of program assessment, using field supervisor estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	3.3

useful to both, the mean for these procedures was 3.5. This rating indicates that the students found the matrix analysis useful in helping them understand either accomplishments or need for future growth, but not both.

SUMMARY OF A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW CONDUCTED WITH 1973-1974 SEST TRAINEES IN REFERENCE TO CURRENT JOB PLACEMENT

A telephone interview survey (Appendix H) was conducted by Ellen Victory Bell and Narveline Drenna, June 11 through June 17, 1975, to determine what positions the 1973-1974 SEST graduates held. Nine of the former ten trainees were available and contacted for the interview. A series of questions were posed concerning three basic areas: (1) Job Title/Position; (2) Task Area Responsibility; and (3) Contract Period/Salary.

It was found that the 1973-1974 SEST graduates held a variety of jobs (Table 4-1). 78% of the graduates held supervisory or administrative positions one year after leaving the project. Three of the graduates were seeking other positions for 1975-1976. One of them planned to return to The University of Texas at Austin for a semester and the other two had applied for teaching positions in a different setting.

When examining the task area responsibilities (Table 4-2) some differences were apparent. Of the seven graduates in non-teaching positions, two were able to report their duties as primarily supervisory, and one of the seven had primarily administrative duties. The other four graduates had jobs encompassing a combination of supervisory and administrative duties.

TABLE 4-1

CURRENT JOB TITLE-POSITIONS FOR THE 1973-1974 SEST GRADUATES

JOB TITLE-POSITION	NO. OF GRADUATES
Director of Special Education	2
Supervisor of Special Education	2
Consulting Teacher (Supervisory Position)	1
Regional Resource Center Supervisor, TEA	1
Assistant Elementary Principal	1
Resource Teacher	2

TABLE 4-2

TASK AREA RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE 1973-1974 SEST GRADUATES

TASK AREA RESPONSIBILITY	NO. OF GRADUATES
Developing Supporting Services	7
Developing the Organization	6
Developing Learning Resources	6
Developing In-Service Education	6
Relating to the Public	6
Developing Curriculum	4
Staffing for Instruction	3

The contract period for the nine graduates ranged from 9 months and 10 days to 12 months (Table 4-3) while the salary range for the group (Table 4-4) during 1974-1975 was generally between $10,000 and $14,000 with one falling below the $10,000 figure and one above the $14,000 figure. However, the contract salary for 1975-1976 was to be higher for all.

TABLE 4-3

CONTRACT PERIOD FOR THE 1973-1974 SEST GRADUATES

CONTRACT PERIOD	NO. OF GRADUATES
9 months and 10 days	1
10 months	4
11 months	2
12 months	2

TABLE 4-4

CONTRACT SALARY FOR THE 1973-1974 SEST GRADUATES

CONTRACT SALARY	1974-75	1975-76
Less than $10,000	1	1
$10,000 to $13,000	5	3
$13,000 to $14,000	2	1
$14,000 Plus	1	4

Three-fourths of the graduates of the SEST Project are in supervisory or administrative positions the year after graduating. Therefore, heavy emphasis should be placed on preparing them for their new positions and task area responsibilities. These responsibilities, in every case, included developing supporting services, determining the need for a service, locating and using the service, scheduling the service and evaluating the use of the service.

In all cases but one, the seven SEST graduates, working in administrative/supervisory roles, are now developing learning resources, developing the organization, developing in-service education, and working with the public. Therefore, these five areas should be emphasized to a greater extent than developing curriculum or staffing when training special education supervisors.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Field Experience Reporting Form

(FERF)

Field Experience Reporting Form

Directions: Please write firmly so that all copies are clear. Use a separate form for each significant activity.

Name _____ Date _____ Place _____ Time Involved _____

Description (Nos.) _____ _____ _____ _____ Competency (ies) _____ _____ _____ _____

Course work or study _____ Field _____ Project Development _____ Special Activity _____ Other _____

1. Description
(include materials used, if any, purpose, number of participants, kind of participants (teachers, supervisors, etc.))

2. Other explanatory comments

3. Specific Learnings
(include pre- & post-assessment, if any)

4. Personal implications of above learning

5. Evaluation - your response, reaction, feelings

6. Your Planning

total planning resp.	planned part of act.	spontaneous planning	no planning resp.	other -

7. Involvement

leader	participant/leader	fellow participant	observer	no partic. at all	other -

8. Satisfaction

enjoyed & learned	enjoyed, no lear.	no enjoy., but lear.	no enjoy., no lear.

9. Recommendation

- should be done again, as is
- should be done again, with modification
- uncertain
- should not be done again

10. Comments regarding recommendation:

Appendix B

Competency Areas

(1973-1974)

1.0 Assessing: The process of studying the status quo to secure data to use in determining needs for change in the instructional program.

2.0 Planning: The process of developing guidelines for actions to implement goals directed change in the instructional program.

3.0 Implementing: The process of carrying forward and accomplishing goals and objectives according to a plan for instructional change.

4.0 Evaluating: The process of securing, analyzing and interpreting data inputs, processes, and outputs to provide feedback for all relevant persons to use in maintaining or modifying the instructional program.

5.0 Relating to People: The process of establishing and maintaining positive interpersonal relations in order to accomplish planned changes in instructional programs.

6.0 Communication: The process of organizing, transmitting, or receiving information regarding the instructional change process utilizing various media or methods of communication.

7.0 Developing Curriculum: Process of improving the guidelines for instruction.

8.0 Developing Learning Resources: Process of improving the availability of resources for learning in the school or community.

9.0 Staffing for Instruction: Process of improving the procedures of recruitment, selection and assignment of personnel for instructional improvement.

10.0 Developing the Organization: Process of improving the organizational structure to improve instruction.

11.0 Developing Supporting Services: Process of improving the services available to students, parents and staff which, though non-instructional, support the instructional process.

12.0 Developing Inservice Education: Process of improving the quality of instructional practices within the staff by providing opportunities for professional growth.

Appendix C

Critical Competencies

(1974-1975)

DEVELOPING CURRICULUM

A-1 Setting Instructional Goals: Given a mandate to clarify major goals of instruction, the supervisor can lead groups of parents, citizens, specialized personnel, teachers, and pupils through a series of discussions, presentations, training sessions, and other experiences to produce a report showing some of the most important instructional goals on which there is agreement.

A-2 Utilizing Specialized Personnel: Given a need for the production or adaptation of curricula, the supervisor can prepare a proposal to utilize the expertise of a variety of specialized and professional personnel to develop, review, and/or critique the relevance and applicability of curriculum guidelines or content for pupils with specific needs.

A-3 Adapting Curricula: Having secured innovative curricula developed outside the school or district, the supervisor can adapt the curricula to meet the needs of a student or student group, and make them available to local personnel for use in guiding instructional planning.

A-4 Designing Instructional Units: The supervisor can design instructional units which specify performance objectives, instructional sequences, a variety of appropriate teaching/learning activities, materials, and evaluative procedures.

A-5 Writing Educational Plans: Given pertinent diagnostic data on one or more pupils, the supervisor can prepare educational plans for these pupils which specify curricular content and level, appropriate activities and materials, alternative teaching strategies, long and short range learning outcomes, and procedures for evaluation.

DEVELOPING LEARNING RESOURCES

B-1 Producing Learning Materials: Given earning needs and a curricular design to meet those needs, the supervisor can arrange for the production of the necessary learning materials to complement, fulfill, and/or enhance the aims of the curriculum.

B-2 Securing Learning Resources (non-material): Given learning needs and a curricular design to meet those needs, the supervisor can secure, acquire, or arrange for the utilization of the necessary human and/or physical resources to complement, fulfill, and/or enhance the aims of a curriculum.

B-3 Evaluating the Utilization of Learning Resources: Given an array of learning resources currently available for use, the supervisor can design and conduct a study to determine the extent and appropriateness of their utilization, and based on the results of that

study, can make recommendations for the improved utilization of specific learning resources in specific ways.

B-4 Evaluating and Selecting Learning Materials: Given expressed needs for learning materials, the supervisor can develop a set of evaluative criteria and procedures to determine the quality, utility, and availability of learning materials, and can organize and conduct review sessions where teachers and other personnel can apply the criteria to new materials and make recommendations for acquisitions in needed areas.

STAFFING FOR INSTRUCTION

C-1 Developing a Staffing Plan: Given a new project proposal which specifies budget, general objectives, and operational procedures, the supervisor can describe essential staff positions to be filled, develop job descriptions for each, and specify the competencies required of the individuals who will fill the positions.

C-2 Recruiting and Selecting Personnel: Given a description of several staff positions to be filled, the supervisor, by engaging in a variety of selective recruitment activities, can secure a list of several possible applicants from various sources, can systematically secure and validate relevant information on the applicants by conducting personal interviews, by checking with previous employers, and by using other selection procedures, and can prepare a set of recommendations for filling the vacancies with the applicants who will best fulfill job requirements.

C-3 Assigning Personnel: Given the task of assigning new personnel and reassigning currently employed personnel to achieve instructional improvements, the supervisor can analyze the needs, expectations, and composition of existing staff groups in various units, and, based on that analysis, can prepare and justify recommendations for assigning and reassigning staff members to positions for optimum educational opportunity.

C-4 Allocating Time to Function: Given various staff positions and personnel functioning in them, the supervisor can design and conduct a time utilization study, analyzing each position with respect to the amount of time spent in each role, and can propose modifications of time distribution among the functions of instruction, supervision, general administration, and special pupil services in order to improve instruction.

ORGANIZING FOR INSTRUCTION

D-1 Monotoring New Arrangements: Given the task of implementing a new organizational arrangement, the supervisor can determine reporting procedures, compare actual operations with planned developments, and when necessary, make recommendations to modify operations to bring them into agreement with formulated plans.

D-2 Revising Existing Structures: Having determined the strengths and weaknesses of an existing organizational structure, the supervisor can propose carefully reasoned or research supported changes, which may include the alteration of assignments, of the use of staff time, of the required reporting patterns, or of the allocation of resources to improve efficiency, productivity, and morale, and, in so doing, improve the instructional process.

D-3 Scheduling Services: Given diagnoses of pupils' needs and regular instructional personnel, the supervisor can propose a set of schedules to distribute services appropriately, to balance the loads of the staff members who provide the services, and to provide that recipients of the services maintain maximum involvement in their school programs.

D-4 Assimilating Programs: Given successful instructional program operating within a center, school, classroom, or other unit, the supervisor can design a plan for the smooth integration of the entire program or selected components thereof into a larger system, prepare a timetable and assignments for the transferring of responsibilities, and assure that the instructional improvement evidenced in the program is continued in the system to which it is transferred.

UTILIZING SUPPORTING SERVICES

E-1 Analyzing and Securing Services: Given a need for a supporting service not currently being used by a district, or by neighboring institutions, agencies or other consumers of supporting services, the supervisor can develop a master list which specifies sources from which to secure various services and describes their availability, quality and cost, and after considering available options, can secure the needed service from the most appropriate source.

E-2 Evaluation of the Utilization of Services: Given a plan for providing supporting services within a district, the supervisor can compare that plan with the current operation by utilizing objective data gathered in accordance with previously identified criteria, and, based on the evaluation, can propose recommendations that would increase the effectiveness and quality of the system.

PROVIDING INSERVICE EDUCATION

F-1 Supervising with the Clinical Model: Given a teacher experiencing difficulties within a classroom, the supervisor can lead the teacher through a clinical cycle using classroom observation data, nondirective feedback techniques, and various inservice and planning experiences in appropriate sequence to produce significantly improved teacher behavior.

F-2 Planning for Professional Growth: Given a group of instructional personnel and data concerning various facets of their on-the-job

performance, the supervisor can assist them to establish individual professional growth plans which include objectives for change in classroom practices, a schedule of experiences sequenced for continuous stimulation and growth, criteria specified for terminal and intermediate evaluation, and a specified period for accomplishing the objectives.

F-3 Conducting Training Sessions: Given a description of a staff group, including specific descriptions of their needs for training, the supervisor can design or adapt and conduct training sessions which employ specific objectives, carefully sequenced learning activities, appropriate resources and material, and which can be shown to improve the skills of the participants.

F-4 Utilizing Human Resources: In the process of implementing an inservice plan, the supervisor can secure the services of a variety of consultants and resource persons, either from within the school system or from outside, and make arrangements for these consultants to contribute their unique expertise to improve staff competence in specific areas.

F-5 Training Leaders: Given individuals who have demonstrated both a high level of competence in a specific area and emergent leadership capabilities, the supervisor can train these people to conduct previously planned inservice sessions and to provide follow-up activities and support for participants that result in the improvement of instructional skills.

RELATING TO PUBLIC

G-1 Informing the Public: The supervisor can establish, promote and maintain favorable impressions of special education programs among community members by disseminating special education information through the public media, by speaking to public and school groups, by conferring with parents and other interested individuals, and by meeting, as necessary, with community groups and leaders.

G-2 Involving the Public: The supervisor can plan ways in which parents and other interested individuals can become productively involved in and trained to assist at various levels of the special education program.

G-3 Utilizing Public Opinion: Given public opinion data regarding a special education matter, the supervisor can establish the urgency of the topic, determine the validity of the data, and, as appropriate, utilize the data in the decision-making process regarding initiation of new aspects, or the maintenance, revision, or discontinuation of current programs or practices.

Appendix D

Activities for Competency Attainment

1973-1975

1. Attended lecture: this includes especially class lectures but may refer to any meeting where lecturing was the most significant form of instruction.

2. Read article or book: this includes reading for any purpose; term paper research, collecting information on a topic, etc.

3. Used a module, programmed instruction or a self instructional unit: this includes all material which has purpose or purposes which may be accomplished solely thru the use of the material.

4. Saw a film or tape: this may be for any purpose but does not include your showing a film or tape for the instruction of others (which would be under 8 or 13 below).

5. Did a simulation, game or laboratory exercise: this would not include your presenting one of these to a group (that would be under 8, 13 or 15 below).

6. Attended a workshop or demonstration: this includes attendance to find out about the subject matter covered or about how to conduct workshops.

7. Planned a workshop or demonstration: this includes situations where you have a major role in the planning, even if you do not conduct the workshop.

8. Conducted workshop or demonstration: this includes workshops in which you had a major conducting role, even if this was shared with others.

9. Consulted w/teacher: this includes the one-to-one or one-to-team kind of conference, not a school wide faculty meeting; the consultation may be to any purpose; this does not include observation of such a conference.

10. Conducted a classroom observation with a guide: this includes observation of a whole class using any kind of guide or tabulation (include observation of one child or a small group for a single purpose under 12 below).

11. Conducted a classroom observation with a guide: a more general observation or visit than 10 above.

12. Did a case study, behavior tally or anecdotal record on one child: includes observation for a specific purpose.

13. Used an instrument/questionnaire/test with a group: this does not include observation guides but does include any assessment or evaluative instrument you administered.

14. Used an instrument/questionnaire/test myself: this does not include observation guides. Check 13 if you administered an instrument but did not take it; check 13 & 14 if you administered and used the instrument; check 14 if the instrument was administered to you.

15. Introduced new method, procedure, technique: this will usually be checked along with "conducted a workshop" or other method of introduction.

16. Participated in district or school assessment or evaluation: this includes any kind of participation; may be checked along with 9, 13, 19, 20, 22, or others.

17. Conducted a parent conference: this includes situations where you are providing the major part of the information or assistance to the parent, regardless of who else may be in attendance.

18. Attended an ARD or LST meeting: this includes both observation and participation in such a meeting.

19. Tabulated, interpreted or analyzed data: this includes activities after the data has been collected to the purpose of formulating a report of recommendation.

20. Wrote a report or summary: this includes reports of any type, especially those which reflect data collection and analysis.

21. Designed or adapted material: this involves creating totally new material or significantly and creatively adapting old material for the purpose of curriculum change or development of new learning resources.

22. Interviewed: this includes purposeful conferences, especially those to recruit, hire or assign personnel or to obtain very specific information; this does not include the typical problem solving teacher or parent conference.

23. Participated in the recruitment or assignment of professional personnel: this includes evaluation of applicants for employment, interviews and discussion of applicant qualifications.

24. Planned or participated in a public relations program: this includes planning a PTA program but not simply attendance at a meeting; includes also particpation in any meeting intended to enchance community understanding or involvement in school programs.

25. Attended school board meeting: whether or not you actually participated in the discussion.

26. Attended a meeting with field supervisors: this includes principals meetings, committee meetings or others where your supervisor attends regularly or is invited to attend; this can also include attendance at a faculty meeting; this includes meetings where you substitute for your supervisor.

27. Visited another educational site not in the district to which you are assigned: this includes schools, laboratories, service centers, etc.

28. Consulted with a school, district or educational enterprise other than that to which you are assigned. Check 27 if the visit was exploratory; check 28 if the visit was for the purpose of your providing information or assistance.

29. Attended an educational conference: this does include conventions or regular meetings of organizations but conferences organized on a specific topic or group of topics.

30. Attended a meeting of a professional organization; this includes regular meetings, not conferences or conventions.

31. Attended a convention: this includes annual nationwide, statewide or districtwide conventions.

32. Other (please specify)

33. Conference with principal: any conference with the principal for any purpose.

34. Conference with any other educational personnel: this can include counselors, diagnosticians, service center people, etc.

35. SEST meeting: this can include meetings with SEST students, faculty and/or staff but does not include conferences wtih your faculty supervisor about your internship. (use 36 for that)

36. Conference withinternship field and/or faculty supervisor.

37. Observation of a meeting or conference: this includes meetings in which you take no part at all.

38. Meetings with sales people: this includes meetings for the purpose of demonstration and/or purchase of materials, equipment, supplies, etc.

Appendix E

Guidelines For Exploratory

Field Experiences

Special Education Supervisor Training Project
Guidelines for Exploratory Field Experiences

I. Purposes

A. To gain familiarity with the overall administrative and supervisory structure in the assigned district or educational institution.

B. To gain detailed knowledge about operations of at least one supervisory position.

C. To develop, strengthen or refine competencies in some specific area.

D. To compare and contrast leadership concepts to real situations, problems, and people.

II. Cooperating Educational Institution and Supervisor

A. Is asked to acquaint the trainee with the various levels and special projects within the Special Education program.

B. Is asked, whenever possible, to tailor the trainee's opportunities and experiences to some competency needs.

C. Is asked to involve the trainee in a variety of activities that relate to instructional leadership responsibilities. Suggested activities include the following:

1. Selecting and sequencing of instructional materials for a unit or module.

2. Assisting with the writing of educational plans for a student or group.

3. Observing in classrooms and reporting feedback to teachers and supervisors.

4. Conferring with parents or a parent group regarding student needs.

5. Participating in LST and ARD meetings including taking special responsibility for presenting some information to the group.

6. Planning and conducting an in-service training session.

7. Planning and directing a parent education training session.

8. Screening for selecting staff.

D. Is asked to work with the student in deciding on minor projects that would benefit both the district and the trainee.

E. Is asked to arrange for the trainee to attend civic meetings concerning school matters, PTA, study groups, school board meetings, etc.

F. Is asked to introduce trainee to building principals, and explain the trainee's activities which affect that particular school.

G. Is asked to meet regularly with the student and the assigned university supervisor to discuss events, review competency needs and project plans.

H. Is asked to describe the trainee's competencies at the end of his assignment.

III. Trainee

A. Is asked to function as much like a regular staff member as the situation permits; becoming familiar with policies of the assigned institution, respecting the confidentiality of professional relationships, and being responsive to institutional expectations and concerns.

B. Is asked to keep a written record of activities, meetings, conferences and educational trips, and to relate such experiences to specific competencies.

C. Is asked to assume responsibility for the scheduling of meetings with field and faculty supervisors (triad).

D. Is asked to review special project plans with the above supervisors and submit carefully documented reports to them.

E. Is asked to develop a set of prioritized competency needs for future growth planning.

F. Is asked to relate as many on-campus experiences to the field (and vice versa) as possible.

IV. General Provisions

A. Average hours per week in each field assignment should approximate ten (10) unless special provisions are made.

B. The SEST staff will furnish the field supervisor with a student vita, weekly schedule and data sheet of competency needs.

C. The SEST staff will assume the responsibility for explaining the project to building principals, new supervisors within the district and other concerned with the field experiences.

Appendix F

Guidelines for Field Experiences

(The Internship)

Special Education Supervisory Training Project
Guidelines for Field Experiences--THE INTERNSHIP

I. Purposes

A. The over-riding purpose is to provide the trainee with opportunities for developing instructional leadership competencies. To this end, three outcomes are anticipated:

1. To develop those specific competencies assessed as high priority needs.

2. To explore on-the-job situations and problems to gain experience in applying competencies.

3. To develop competencies of special interest in the trainee.

B. Another purpose is to provide some useful professional service to the institution in which the trainee is serving. To this end, trainees are:

1. To assume responsibility for an assigned portion of the work regularly assigned to another supervisor or administrator.

2. To complete one or more special projects for the improvement of instruction.

C. Still another purpose is to provide real but controlled and monitored experiences which facilitate integration of knowledge, skill and attitude into practice.

D. Finally, a purpose is to provide feedback for use in evaluating training program and trainee competence.

II. Cooperating Educational Institution and Supervisor

A. Is asked to involve intern in all operational phases that accompany the particular supervisor position to which he/she is assigned.

B. Is asked to participate in conferences with intern and with University faculty members for exchange of mutual concerns, planning and structuring of learning experiences, diagnosis of competency needs, and evaluation of outcomes.

C. Is asked to introduce intern to building principals, where applicable, and explain intern's duties, projects, etc. which affect that particular school.

D. Is asked to work cooperatively with the intern student in the selection, planning, implementation, and evaluation of special projects of mutual benefit.

E. Is asked to guide intern in assuming significant responsibility in all areas relative to the position to which he/she is assigned.

F. Is asked to allow intern to assume responsibility in civic and community meetings, educational trips, ARD meetings, etc.

G. Is asked to provide opportunities for the intern to use an interaction observation system and report feedback to the teachers observed.

H. Is asked to contact assigned faculty supervisor if any questions or problems arise.

I. Is asked to assist in assessing intern's competencies and other facets of the program at the conclusion of the assignment.

III. Intern

A. Is expected to function as much like a regular staff member as is possible.

B. Is asked to keep a daily written record of activities in a standard format provided by the project.

C. Is expected to respect the confidentiality of the professional relationship and to exercise a full code of ethics in all respects.

D. Is expected to exercise initiative in planning and carrying out activities associated with II D, II F, and II G.

E. Is expected to work closely and cooperatively with assigned field supervisor in undertaking activities associated with II A, II E, and II H.

F. Is expected to submit to appropriate officials and to faculty supervisor a carefully written project report for each special project undertaken.

G. Is expected to undertake readings in appropriate technical-professional sources as related to each special project to provide documentation for decisions, actions, outcomes, or recommendations associated with the projects and their reports.

H. Is expected to exercise the initiative in conferring with his/her field and University supervisor frequently.

I. Is expected to develop and maintain a working schedule for meeting

field, campus, and special activity requirements in a way that promotes continuity and efficiency in field assignments.

J. Is expected to assume major responsibility for translating campus and special experiences into opportunities for field practice related to competency needs.

IV. General Provisions

A. Unless special provisions are made, interns should plan to remain in a given field assignment from January through May with the same field and faculty supervisors.

B. Field assignments should be individualized within these guidelines to maximize experience and competency development.

C. Field assignments can and should vary from week to week to allow for the demands of both field and campus.

D. Average hours per week in each field assignment should approximate fifteen (15) unless special provisions are made.

E. Interns should be presented in the field as "part-time member of the staff" to avoid unnecessary reistance and assure maximum productivity.

F. The SEST project staff will assume resposibility for input to building principals about the purposes and activities of the project.

Appendix G

End of Program

Evaluation Questionnaire

1973-1974

End of Program Evaluation

Questionnaire

May 1974

The purpose of this form is to provide feedback to the staff concerning the aspects of the program on which you feel comments should be made. Please try to respond with constructive, objective input, rather than generalities. Whenever possible, make suggestions that you feel would be viable alternatives for improvement of any aspect of the program.

I. Classwork

A. To what degree was the classwork helpful to you in gaining knowledge and/or skills that you consider to be essential to your growth?

B. What aspects should be continued or enlarged?

C. How could classwork have been more helpful to you?

D. Should additional courses be included? or at least available? which ones?

E. Other comments or suggestions regarding classwork.

II. Fieldwork

A. Evaluate your field assignment in terms of its ability to prepare you to be a Special Education supervisor?

B. How could it have been more beneficial?

C. What aspect(s) was the most helpful?

D. What frustrations did your field supervisor experience in connection with your work together? How could it (they) be remedied?

E. What would you think of field assignments that were topic or competency oriented, in which you would work for a specified time to accomplish a specific assignment and then move on to another assignment, rather than serving the whole semester with one person.

F. In what specific areas would you like to have had field experience which you didn't get?

G. How could field experiences be more individualized?

H. Other comments or suggestions regarding field work.

III. Materials

A. To what extent did you use project materials?

B. To what extent were the ones you used helpful? Which ones did you use?

C. How could the materials be made a more integral part of the program?

D. Other comments regarding materials.

IV. Program Operation

A. What aspects of the program operation do you feel were helpful to you and/or contributed to the program?

B. What specific aspects of program operation could be improved so as to be more helpful to students? Do you have suggestions for improving them?

C. Do you feel that any aspects were counterproductive or inhibited you in some way? If so, what are they, and how should they be changed?

D. What should be the student's role in the ongoing operation of the program?

E. Other comments regarding program operation.

V. General

A. What items or aspects of the program stand out as being most beneficial, helpful or memorable in terms of professional growth

B. Do you feel that any aspects of the program should be completely deleted? If so, which ones, why, and should they be replaced with anything?

C. Should anything be added to the program that was not included? What and why?

D. Do you have any other comments that have not been expressed so far?

Appendix H

End of Program

Evaluation Questionnaire

1974-1975

Special Education Supervisor Training Project

End of Program Evaluation

May, 1975

The purpose of this form is to provide feedback to the staff concerning the aspects of the program on which you feel comments should be made. Please try to respond with constructive, objective input, rather than generalities. Whenever possible, make suggestions that you feel would be viable alternatives for improvement of any aspect of the program. Please complete this on your own without consulting with other students. Please give careful thought to your responses as the information will be very important to us in structuring next year's program. Be sure to use the back of the sheets or additional pages if your comments won't fit in the space provided.

Classwork

(1) To what degree was the classwork helpful to you in gaining knowledge and/or skills that you consider to be essential to your growth?

	Not Very Helpful				Extremely Helpful
Ed A 380G (McIntyre)	1	2	3	4	5
Ed A 385 Practicum (Harris)(Valverde)	1	2	3	4	5
Ed A 383 Inservice Design (Harris)	1	2	3	4	5
Ed A 383 Org. Theory (Thomas)	1	2	3	4	5
Ed A 382M Sp. Ed. Adm. (Yates)	1	2	3	4	5
Ed A 384G Seminar in Supervision (Harris)	1	2	3	4	5
Ed C 381M Curriculum Design (Davis)	1	2	3	4	5
S.W.395K Human Relations (Williams)	1	2	3	4	5
Other Courses:					
_____	1	2	3	4	5

	Not Very Helpful				Extremely Helpful
_____	1	2	3	4	5
_____	1	2	3	4	5

(2) How could classwork have been more helpful to you? (Refer to specific courses when appropriate.)

(3) Was classwork related to the critical competencies? Be specific, which courses related to which competencies best?

Courses	Critical Competencies
Ed A 380G (McIntyre)----------	_____
Ed A 385 Practicum (Harris) (Valverde)-----	_____
Ed A 383 Inservice Design (Harris----------	_____
Ed A 383 Org. Theory (Thomas)----------	_____
Ed A 382M Sp. Ed. Adm. (Yates)----------	_____
Ed A 384G Seminar in Supervision (Harris)--	_____
Ed C 381M Curriculum Design (Davis)--------	_____
S.W. 395K Human Relations (Williams)-------	_____

Fieldwork

(4) Indicate the Exploratory field assignments you recall which related well to one or more critical competencies. Specify both the king of experience and competency.

(5) Indicate the Internship field assignments you recall which related well to one or more critical competencies. Specify both the kind of experience and competency.

(6) How would you evaluate the internship field site to which you were assigned in terms of providing for your growth in:

	Limited				Extensive
Critical competency development--------	1	2	3	4	5
Human relations skill development------	1	2	3	4	5
Problem solving skill development------	1	2	3	4	5
Self-confidence as a dynamic leader-----	1	2	3	4	5
Other (Specify)_____-----	1	2	3	4	5
_____-----	1	2	3	4	5

(7) In what specific competency areas would you like to have had field experience which you didn't get?

Materials, Travel and Other

(8) How often did you use the Learning Laboratory materials? (check one)

_____1. Fewer than 10 hours

_____2. Ten to twenty-five hours

_____3. Twenty-five to fifty hours

_____4. Fifty to one hundred hours

_____5. Over one hundred hours

(9) In which competency areas did you make specific use of Learning Lab materials? (Check one or more)

_____A. Developing Curriculum

_____B. Developing Learning Resources

_____C. Staffing for Instruction

_____D. Organizing for Instruction

_____E. Utilizing Supporting Services

_____F. Providing In-Service Education

_____G. Relating to Public

(10) Indicate the competency development value of each of the special activities below.

	Slightly Valuable				Extremely Valuable
1. Pre-Session Campout	1	2	3	4	5
2. Interviewing at Port Aransas	1	2	3	4	5
3. Interviewing at Killeen	1	2	3	4	5
4. Attending a Professional Meeting (CEC, ASCD, Etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
5. Other (Specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5

(11) What suggestions do you have with regard to adding or deleting workshops, field trips, and special activities?

Competency Assessment

(12) How useful did you find each of the efforts at competency assessment in guiding your training activities?

	Not Very Useful				Extremely Useful
a. Preassessment, using self-estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	1	2	3	4	5
b. Preassessment, using self-estimates on the Major Competency Assessment Inventory	1	2	3	4	5
c. In-progress assessment, using self-estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory (December)	1	2	3	4	5

	Not Very Useful				Extremely Useful
d. In-progress assessment, using self-estimates on the Major Competency Assessment Inventory	1	2	3	4	5
e. In-progress assessment, using faculty supervisor estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	1	2	3	4	5
f. In-progress assessment, using field supervisor (exploratory) estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	1	2	3	4	5
g. End of program assessment, using self-estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	1	2	3	4	5
h. End of program assessment, using self-estimates on the Major Competency Assessment Inventory	1	2	3	4	5
i. End of program assessment, using faculty supervisor estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	1	2	3	4	5
j. End of program assessment, using field supervisor estimates on the Critical Competency Inventory	1	2	3	4	5

(13) How valid do you think your scores were on the Knowledge Assessment Tests for Critical Competencies at the end of the program?

Valid on only a few		Valid for most		Valid on nearly all
1	2	3	4	5

(14) How useful are the matrix analysis and other procedures as used for the end-of-program assessment in helping you understand both accomplishments and needs for future growth?

Not very useful		Useful on one, but not both		Highly useful on both
1	2	3	4	5

(15) Your Name_____Date_____

RETURN TO SEST PROJECT OFFICE! Thanks. Ben M. Harris

Appendix I

Telephone Interview

Questionnaire

For

1973-1974

SEST Students

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

1973-74 SEST Students

Name_____ Date_____

Interviewer_____

Hello. My name is _____, and I'm calling from the SEST Project at the University of Texas. We wanted to get some information from you in order to update our file on 1973-74 SEST students. Do you mind answering some question?

Response:_____

JOB TITLE/POSITION

Present job title/position_____

School district, institution_____

Name of doctoral program, if applicable_____

Will this job title/position change for the 1975-76 contract period?

____yes ____no ____maybe

Explain:_____

_____

Job title/position for 1975-76_____

School district for 1975-76_____

DUTIES

Primarily administrative or supervisory duties in 1974-75 position? Circle one. Other_____

What task areas have you been primarily concerned with in 1974-75?

____Developing Curriculum
____Developing Learning Resources
____Staffing for Instruction
____Developing the Organization
____Developing Supporting Services
____Developing In-Service Education
____Relating to the Public

Primarily administrative or supervisory duties in 1975-76 position? Circle one. Other_____

CONTRACT PERIOD/SALARY

Contract period 1974-75:

9 month_____ 10 month_____ 11 month_____ 12 month_____

Contract period 1975-76:

9 month_____ 10 month_____ 11 month_____ 12 month_____

For those working:

1974-75 salary	1975-76 salary
____less than $10,000	____less than $10,000
____$10,000-$13,000	____$10,000-$13,000
____$13,000-$14,000	____$13,000-$14,000
____$14,000+	____$14,000+

Graduate students: ____stipend ____no stipend

FURTHER FOLLOW-UP

We have made plans to do a more extensive follow-up with the 1973-74 SEST students, and we would like very much for you to participate. This will involve filling out some competency assessment forms, which would take approximately 2-3 hours to complete. Would you be willing to take time to do this?

____yes ____no

Other Comments:_____

We are thinking of a workshop here in Austin in July to gather some information from 1973-74 SEST students. Let me tell you what we have in mind, and then I'll ask you if you prefer attending the workshop or filling out the forms and returning them to us.

A half-day workshop would be to fill out the competency assessment forms and briefly compare notes on present job situations. The whole-day workshop would be to fill out the forms, look at new materials and get some rather extensive feedback from you on use of the materials, as well as to reacquaint ourselves with each other's job situation.

Do you prefer attending either the workshop or having the forms mailed to you?

_____ mail-out _____workshop

Do you prefer the half-day or whole-day workshop?

_____ half-day _____ whole-day

Would it influence your decision if expenses were paid to attend the workshop?

_____ yes _____ no

Worshop day preference:

_____ Thursday, July 3
_____ Monday, July 7
_____ Tuesday, July 8
_____ Wednesday, July 9

Do you have a preference for a starting time? _____ Departure time? _____

We will be back in touch with you by June 23. At that time we can tell you what day the workshop will be scheduled, if there is to be one, the time, and whether any expenses will be paid. Is this soon enough for you to know?

_____ yes _____ no
Need to know by _____

Do you have any questions you would like to ask before I call you back?

_____ _____

_____

Thank you. I will be back in touch with you.

Comments: _____

_____